

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLII

FEBRUARY, 1927

Number 2

SIDNEY, GALAUT, LA CALPRENÈDE: AN EARLY INSTANCE OF THE INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH LITERATURE UPON FRENCH

In an appendix to his *Théâtre français avant la période classique*,¹ Rigal declares that La Calprenède's tragedy, *Phalante*,² is an imitation of a play by the same name written by a certain Jean Galaut, but he neither gives his proof nor attempts to find the source of the latter play. Two years ago I examined Galaut's tragedy³ and found that Rigal was quite justified in connecting the two French plays, but the source of the earlier one remained to be determined. The other day I ran across the statement in an article by Mr. H. W. Lawton⁴ that the love of "Phalante et Philoxène pour Hélène, reine de Corinthe," as described in Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*, "fournit à La Calprenède le sujet d'une tragédie, *Phalante*." Mr. Lawton says nothing of Galaut, leaves us under the impression that Sidney's influence was exerted directly upon La Calprenède, and confuses the names of Sidney's characters, for in the *Arcadia* Phalantus is the brother, not the lover of Helen. Nevertheless his statement was essential to the clearing up of the problem.

The story in question does not occur in the so-called *Old Arcadia*, but it is found in the first edition of Sidney's novel, that of 1590, where the eleventh chapter of the first book is concerned with

¹ Paris, Hachette, 1901, p. 322.

² Paris, Sommarville, 1642; *privilege*, May 3, 1641.

³ The only copy known to exist is at the municipal library of Toulouse, where I had previously located it with the help of Mr. C. I. Sillin and a librarian at the *Bibliothèque Nationale*.

⁴ "Notes sur Jean Baudoin et sur ses traductions de l'Anglais," *R. L. C.*, vi (1926), 677.

Helen, Queen of Corinth, beloved of the "Lord Philoxenus, sonne and heire to the vertuous noble man Timotheus."⁵ This Philoxenus brought to the court his friend Amphialus and asked him to seek for him the queen's hand, but as soon as the stranger began to plead for his friend, Helen fell in love with him and was not long in confessing her state of heart. Shocked at the suggestion that he might be untrue to Philoxenus, Amphialus left the country, but was pursued and attacked by his friend as soon as the latter had learned from the queen how matters stood. In defending himself, Amphialus caused the death of Philoxenus, which was followed by that of Timotheus, who came up to stop the fight and was overcome upon seeing that his son had died by the hand of his friend. Amphialus then departed and Helen set out in search of him. She catches up with him two books later, but the plays under discussion use no further material from this unfinished episode.

Despite Sidney's various contacts with Frenchmen, it is an astonishing fact that this tale became so soon the basis of a French play. English literature was practically unknown in France. Those Scotch or English writers who had a hearing there, Buchanan, More, etc., wrote in Latin. Green's *Pandosto* did not inspire French dramatists till after its translation into French in 1615. The *Arcadia*, on the other hand, though not translated until 1624, became the source of a French play before the end of 1605.

Our information concerning Galaut comes from a volume called *Recueil des diuers poemes et chans Royaux avec le commencement de la traduction de l'Æneid de I. Galaut Aduocat au Parlement de Tolose*.⁶ The legend engraved on an accompanying portrait of the author shows that his name was Jean and that he died in Sept., 1605, at the age of thirty. *Phalante* is one of the works contained in the volume. The plot⁷ is quite simple. Sidney's episode furnishes

⁵ Pp. 66-72 in the edition of M. A. Feuillerat, Cambridge, University Press, 1922.

⁶ Toulouse, veuve de Jacques Colomiez, 1611, 12°. The poems include one on the death of his brother, also a lawyer, and one describing an event of 1596, as well as a masquerade for knights dressed in black, covered with mirrors, flames, and stars.

⁷ Act I, Philoxène talks of his devotion to Phalante and his unrequited

its main incidents. The characters and names of the four principal persons are retained except for the fact that the name of the hero is changed from Amphialus to Phalante, who, in the *Arcadia*, is Helen's brother and takes no part in the episode. Subordinate persons are added to help the dialogue or to explain certain points in the action. At times the imitation is close: "I told him that I would heare him more willingly, if he would speake for Amphialus, as well as Amphialus had done for him" becomes

Parlés-moy pour Phalant [*sic*] comme il a faict pour vous (iv, 2).

In both cases the rejected suitor calls his friend a traitor when he overtakes him in the wood. On the other hand, a statement of fact in Helen's narrative may be turned into a dialogue, as when the sentence, "I discovered my affection unto him," inspires a conversation in which occurs a couplet that might have given food for thought to Longfellow's Priscilla, had she read Galaut before she or her family left France:

Mais pourquoy cher Phalant' [*sic*], & dictes moy pourquoy
Vous ne parlés pour vous comme ie fay pour moy? (ii, 1.)

Timothee's dream was added to give an impression of impending doom, the rescue of the shepherdess to explain how the hero

love for Hélène, with whom he had played as a child, and is advised to ask Phalante to help him. Hélène tells her attendants that she loves none of her many suitors. Phalante promises aid to his friend. Act II, Phalante urges Hélène to love Philoxenus. She refuses and begs for Phalante's love, even offering him her crown. He assures her that he cannot betray his friend. Act III, Timothée talks of his achievements, of a bad dream he has had, and of his efforts to rid himself of it by the use of magic. A ghost appears calling "Helene, Philoxene." Hélène again pleads for Phalante's love and the latter decides to leave the country. Act IV, Philoxène learns of Phalante's departure, sees Hélène, and discovers her love for Phalante. He vows vengeance. Timothée is informed of his son's resolution and one of the queen's attendants determines to give her the same information. Act V, Philoxène tells of the delay occasioned by his rescue of a shepherdess from three satyrs. Philoxène attacks him and "s'enferme luy mesme." Timothée enters and dies from the shock caused by what he sees. Phalante leaves after consecrating his arms and armor to the shade of Philoxène. The bodies are carried off for burial. Hélène discovers Phalante's blood-stained arms, concludes that he is dead, and kills herself. Phalante returns, finds her body, tears out his eyes, and commits suicide.

is so easily overtaken. The duel was arranged in such a way as to clear Phalante of all guilt. A *dénouement* had to be added, as the action of the original episode was incomplete. To work out these details Galaut had recourse to the contemporary pastoral drama, in which shepherdesses were constantly rescued from satyrs, and to ancient literature, which must have inspired the putting out of the hero's eyes and the consecration of the arms and armor, probably also the scene of incantation.⁸ As the suicide of the heroine, motivated by the erroneous belief that the hero is dead, and his own suicide on finding her corpse constitute a situation that was familiar to readers of Ovid's account of Pyramus and Thisbe, it is unnecessary to suppose that Galaut was acquainted with *Romeo and Juliet*.

In his omission of the chorus, his careful exposition, and his use of preparation Galaut displays the qualities of a practical playwright. He has no hesitation about showing us combat and death on the stage. That he did not attempt a more profound exploration of the souls of his characters or give his play greater unity is not surprising on the part of a writer of his generation.

Although forgotten to-day, the play met with some success. There is no reason to doubt that it was acted, as we have the record of a prologue written for the tragedy of *Phalante* by the farce actor, Des Lauriers, called Bruscamille, and the following reference in that document to the plot fits very well that of Galaut's play:

Philoxene rompt la chaîne qui l'attachoit à l'amitié de son cher Phalante, mais plutôt de son fidèle Oreste &c . . . l'on voit un Prince qui met l'affection en arriere, pour rechercher, au péril de sa vie, un contentement particulier.⁹

⁸ The *Œdipus* of Seneca, for instance, contains the first and last of these three motifs.

⁹ Cited by the frères Parfait, iv, 136-139. They did not know Galaut's play and declared that the tragedy of *Phalante* was played in 1610, apparently because they used an edition of Bruscamille which they date "vers 1612," for their usual method of determining the date of a play's first performance is to subtract a year or two from that of a publication that concerns it. Paul Lacroix, probably the first person to connect Galaut's play with the tragedy mentioned in the prologue, examined the latter in an edition of Bruscamille of 1615. Cf. the *Bibliothèque dra-*

It may have had two editions, for mention is made in the *Bibliothèque du théâtre français*¹⁰ of an anonymous octavo of 1610 printed without name of town or publisher, though it is possible that this is the same as the one described above, for, if detached from the other works of Galaut, it would show no name of author, publisher, or city, and it is well known that little distinction was made between octavo and duodecimo editions. The date of 1610 would, in that case, be borrowed from the frères Parfait. That the play was utilized by Mairet has been pointed out in my edition of the latter's *Chryseide et Arimand*.¹¹ That it became the source of La Calprenède's *Phalante* is still more obvious.¹²

By the time that the latter play was written, however, a good deal of water had passed under the bridge. If the classical system had not been altogether developed, it had already caused drama-

matique de M. de Soleinne, I, No. 948 and second supplement, No. 127. Rigal, *loc. cit.*, asked if the play might not have been written by Hardy, but he had no evidence and his question was obviously inspired by his unwillingness to admit that anyone could have written a play that was acted on a professional stage as early as this except Hardy.

¹⁰ I, 440-441. The detailed analysis there given makes it obvious that the play discussed is the same as Galaut's *Phalante*.

¹¹ Baltimore, 1925, pp. 161, 162, where a couplet in *Phalante*, I, 3:

Je te suiuray par tout, le nœud qui nous assemble

Veut que s'il faut mourir nous mourions tous ensemble,

is compared with ll. 1631, 1632 of *Chryseide*:

Console toy mon cœur, le nœud qui nous assemble,

Veut que si nous mourons, nous mourions tous ensemble.

Cf. also *Phalante*, II, 1:

Cil qui ne s'ayme point ne peut aymer personne

with *Chryseide*, v. 906:

Qui n'aime pas soy-mesme il n'aime pas autrui.

¹² The plot also resembles that of Corneille's *Mélite*, for in both the unsuccessful lover brings to his sweetheart the man with whom she falls in love, but the resemblance is not sufficient to prove influence, although as much can be said for it as has been said by Dr. Kuchler (*Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, v (1913), 679-681), or Dr. Van Roosbroeck (*The Genesis of Corneille's Mélite*, printed without date about 1920) to prove that Corneille derived his play from Hardy's *Gésippe* or *Dorise*. As a matter of fact, we have here an incident treated by a long list of authors including Boccaccio, Lilly, Sidney, Hardy, and Galaut. It remains to be proved whether Corneille followed one of them, or some other author, or whether he was inspired by a situation in real life.

tists to concentrate their attention on character rather than events and make popular a certain degree of unity in structure. La Calprenède's chief innovation¹³ is to make Phalante fall in love with Hélène so that he has a greater struggle than in Galaut and Sidney. Hélène, moreover, has to contend with her pride and her confession of love is spread over three scenes in which she steadily becomes more and more outspoken, whereas Galaut had made her explain herself in no uncertain terms in the first interview and merely repeat herself in the second. In accordance with the rules of propriety, the fight and the death of Philoxène are kept off the stage, but, as suicide could be witnessed by the audience, we are allowed to see both Hélène and Phalante when they kill themselves. Timandre, as the father of Philoxène, is now called, survives the sight of his son's death and even proposes taking vengeance on Phalante. The extraneous material contained in the account of the shepherdess's rescue and of the old man's dream with the vision of the ghost is omitted. The action becomes more rapid and may take place within twenty-four hours, though the unity of place in its stricter sense is not kept, for both the queen's bed-room and a forest some distance away are represented. La Calprenède brings his leading characters together in the last act, as his predecessors had not done, by altering Hélène's mode of death. Instead of following Phalante, she sends for him after quietly taking poison at home. He arrives in time to hear her last confession of love and to make one of his own, after which he kills himself with his sword and she follows him as soon as the poison allows.

It is clear that La Calprenède follows Galaut rather than Sidney, for, to mention only the most important pieces of evidence, in both plays the hero is named Phalante, Philoxène throws himself on his friend's sword, and both Hélène and Phalante commit suicide, none of which things can be said of Sidney's characters. Moreover, there is nothing in the *Arcadia* that is found in La Calprenède and not in Galaut. This fact is somewhat surprising, as La Calprenède based three plays on English history or tradition and could have had easy access to a French translation of the *Arcadia*. But it is less strange than the other fact brought out in

¹³ For a brief analysis of the play and a general study of La Calprenède as a dramatist, cf. my article in *M. P.*, XVIII (1920), 121-141, 345-360.

this article, that Galaut based his play on Sidney's novel. Nevertheless the internal evidence offered by the similarity of names, incidents, and even some of the dialogue obliges us to accept the fact that a lawyer of Toulouse, as early as 1605, was sufficiently acquainted with English to make use of the *Arcadia*, unless a common source for Sidney and Galaut can be found. That such a source may exist is, of course, possible, yet Brie,¹⁴ who discusses at length the influence of pastoral and chivalric novels, late Greek romances, and other material obviously used by Sidney, can do no better than show a parallel between the episode in question and a story in Lilly's *Euphues* and suggest that Sidney derived it either from the latter work or from its source, the story of Titus and Gesippus in the *Decameron*.¹⁵ But neither Lilly nor Boccaccio is so close to Galaut as Sidney is, for they do not have the same proper names as the two latter writers, nor are the situations and characters as near Galaut's as are Sidney's. Since Galaut was only eleven years old when Sidney died and fifteen when the *Arcadia* was published, one cannot suppose the French play to have been written early enough for the Englishman to be acquainted with it. My conclusion is, therefore, that, just as La Calprenède subsequently based his play on Galaut, Galaut derived his from Sidney, and that we have here a very early case, the earliest with which I am acquainted, of the influence of English literature upon French.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

ITALIAN BORROWINGS IN SIDNEY

Two interesting loans from Italian literature occur in the first book of the *Arcadia*: Kalender's lampoon on Mopsa and Dorus's account of the "strange operation of love." To these may per-

¹⁴ *Sidney's Arcadia*, Strassburg, Trübner, 1918, pp. 183, 184. For certain bibliographical suggestions in regard to the *Arcadia* I am indebted to Dr. Edwin Greenlaw.

¹⁵ Cf. S. L. Wolff in *M. P.*, VII (1910), 577-585. Neither in his *Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction*, New York, 1912, nor in H. W. Hill's *Sidney's Arcadia and the Elizabethan Drama* (University of Nevada Studies, I (1908), No. 1) is a source for Sidney's episode mentioned.

haps be added one found in *Astrophel and Stella*: the last line of the sonnet to the moon.

The fame of Francesco Berni rests almost as much on his burlesque verses as on his *Rifacimento dell' Orlando Innamorato*, and perhaps the most celebrated of these is the following sonnet, composed in mockery of the Petrarchists:

Chiome d'argento fin, irte ed attorte
 Senz'arte intorno a un *bel viso d'oro*,
 Fronte crespa, u'mirando io mi scoloro,
 Dove spunta i suoi strali Amore e Morte;
Occhi di perle vaghi, luci torte
 Da ogni obbietto diseguale a loro,
 Ciglia di neve, e quelle, ond' io m' accoro,
 Dita e man dolcemente grosse e corte;
 Labbra di latte, *bocca ampia celeste*,
 Denti d' ebano rari e pellegrini,
 Inaudita ineffabile armonia;
 Costumi alteri e gravi: a voi, divini,
 Servi d' Amor, palese fo che queste
 Son le bellezze della donna mia.

It can hardly be doubted that Kalender's song is an imitation of this poem. Here we have Mopsa's "skin like burnished gold," her "eyes bedeck'd with Pearl," her "mouth O heav'nly wide"; here, in the "unheard, ineffable harmony" of l. 11, we have Mopsa's beauties, "such as no man them may know"; here we have the whole conceit of painting a caricature by misapplying the colors of a flattering portrait. It was Berni who first transposed the "precious things" of the Petrarchists' Laura and made them "serve to shew her shape."

The source of Dorus's assertion that love, "like a point in midst of a circle, is still of a nearness" must be immediately obvious to any one at all conversant with Dante. In the eleventh chapter of the *Vita Nuova*, the poet relates how, in a vision, Love rebuked him for too heartily diverting gossip from Beatrice to another lady, and said to him: "Ego' tamquam centrum circuli, cui simili modo se habent circumferentiæ partes; tu autem non sic." This cryptic utterance is supposed to originate with Dante, and it seems to me next to impossible that it should have occurred independently to Sidney. Its interpretation, which has long puzzled Dantologists,

cannot, however, be that put upon it by the English poet in the passage I have quoted from.

The last of my loans may not be a loan at all; that bitter question—"Doe they call virtue there ungratefulness?"—might have been provoked by the circumstances. The fact remains, however, that the following parallels occur in works which Sidney very probably read.

Giovanni della Casa, Sonnet XL:

Donna amar ch' Amor odia e i suoi desiri,
Che sdegno e feritate onore appella!

Tasso, *Aminta*, IV. 1:

Della mia crudeltade
Ch'io chiamava onestade.

Boccaccio, *Decameron*, I. 10:

. . . e alla loro melansaggine hanno posto nome onestà.

C. W. LEMMI.

Goucher College.

SOME STAGE-DIRECTIONS IN *ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL*

In the absence of any early separate edition of *All's Well that Ends Well*, the text of the play derives solely from the corrupt version of the Folio. One notable fault of that version is the frequent omission of stage-directions. In at least a dozen instances it is necessary to supply "Exit" or "Exeunt": entrances, on the other hand, are always correctly indicated, unless, indeed, two of the problems discussed below involve exceptions to the rule. One reservation to this general statement should be made,—when a principal character enters, those in attendance are not always enumerated.

There is a good reason for this discrepancy in the accuracy of the stage-directions. *All's Well* belongs to the group of plays whose texts derive, mediately or immediately, from theatrical prompt-copies. Accuracy in the notation of entrances is an absolute necessity in such a script. An actor off-stage, not following

the course of the play, *must* be notified by the prompter of his approaching entrance. Once on the stage, however, it is not likely that he will forget the moment of his exit: indeed, in most cases he is "cued off" by his own lines or those of a fellow-actor.¹ The indication of exits in the prompt-copy is therefore not a matter of such vital importance. For an analogous reason, it is not absolutely necessary to catalog the names of the attendants of an important character on the occasion of his entrance: notice to the principal actor of the group is generally sufficient.

With these facts in mind let us examine the crux which occurs in Act II, Scene I. The problem here is the disposition of the King between lines 23 and 62.² During this interval Bertram, Parolles and the two Lords conduct a conversation in which the presence of royalty seems to be ignored. Something must be done to avoid the awkward spectacle of a king sitting silent and unattended while his courtiers discuss their private affairs among themselves. The Folios give no stage directions at this point, and the solution of the difficulty must be deduced from the lines of the actors.

Pope solved the problem by making the King leave the stage after line 23, and in this he has been followed by most subsequent editors. The King's last words, "Come hither to me," have been variously interpreted as being addressed to his attendants, who carry him away upon his couch, or to Bertram, who is about to follow him, but is prevented by the First Lord's exclamation, "O my sweet lord, that you will stay behind us!" There is a difference of opinion as to the moment of the King's re-appearance. The majority follow Pope in placing it just before line 50: others make it coincident with Lafeu's entrance at line 62. Capell, unwilling to remove the King from the stage without express warrant from the text, makes him retire to a couch at the back of the stage at line 23 and rise to come forward again at line 50.

There are serious objections to all of these interpretations. If the King's "Come hither to me" is addressed to Bertram, it is scarcely conceivable that he should disobey the command in order to talk with the Lords. If the King re-enters at line 50 the object

¹ Vide R. Crompton Rhodes, *The Stagers of Shakespeare*, 11.

² The line numbering is that of the Oxford *Shakespeare*.

of his removal from the scene has not been attained, since the courtiers carry on the remainder of their private conversation in his presence. Moreover, his unmotivated retirement is patently an artificial device to permit the remaining characters to talk undisturbed. Finally, there is no indication of his re-entrance in the stage-directions.

The following arrangement is suggested as avoiding the difficulties enumerated above without doing violence to the text of the Folio. At the opening of the scene the King enters in a chair or upon a couch, and remains in the center of the stage throughout the scene. At line 23 he dismisses the lords who are departing for the Florentine war, and turning to still another lord, says, "Come hither to me."³ The two engage in pantomime until Lafeu's entrance. Bertram and Parolles, who were not included in the King's address at the beginning of the scene, have remained in the background near one of the side entrances. The departing courtiers pass them on their way off the stage and linger to make their farewells. This exchange of farewells in a far corner of the chamber is, under the circumstances, not unnatural, nor is the subsequent departure of Bertram and Parolles in the wake of the Lords. The King is engrossed in his talk, and there is nothing to show that he has ever been aware of the presence of the gentlemen from Rousillon. As they leave the stage Lafeu bursts in, drops upon his knee, and *interrupts* the King and his counsellor with "Pardon, my lord, for me and for my tidings."

A second problem is found in Act II, Scene v. Lines 94 and 95 read, in the Folio:

Hel. I shall not breake your bidding, good my Lord:
Where are my other men? Monsieur, farewell. *Exit.*

Many modern editions give the second line:

Ber. To Parolles. Where are my other men, monsieur? *To*
Helena. Farewell. *Exit Helena.*

The editors who retain the reading of the Folio point out that it makes perfect sense as it stands, since Helena may well have an attendant to whom her question is addressed. One argument in

³ Thus far the solution agrees with that suggested by L. Kellner, *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, LIII, 42 (1917).

favor of this view seems not to have been adduced, however. The scene is closely connected with the preceding one,—in fact, the two take place in neighboring rooms and are so close in time that they may possibly overlap. Parolles goes directly from Scene iv to Scene v, and Helena follows him after a short delay occasioned by the necessity of taking leave of the King. Her last words, as she left the earlier scene, were a command to the Clown to attend her. He would naturally be still in her company when she enters Scene v, and he is probably the person of whom she inquires, "Where are my other men?" although the real purpose of her question is to convey to Bertram her intention to obey his command at once.

The last problem to be considered occurs in the final scene of the play. The stage-direction at line 158 reads, in the Folio, "*Enter Widow, Diana and Parolles.*" Parolles neither speaks nor is spoken to, however, until line 240, and in the interval, at line 232, appears the direction, "*Enter Parolles.*" It has been tacitly agreed by all editors that the earlier direction is an error, and that Parolles does not appear until he is brought on at line 232. This view is founded on the assumption that no purpose is served by his presence during the first part of the scene, and on the fact that there is no direction for his exit between the two entrances. The first argument fails to take account of lines 201-204:

<i>King.</i>	Mesthought you said You saw one here in court could witness it.
<i>Dia.</i>	I did, my lord, but loath am to produce So bad an instrument: his name's Parolles.

It may be urged that the phrase "in court" means the palace as a whole, and not the royal court in session. But Diana, apparently, has just arrived at the palace: if she has seen Parolles at all it must have been either in the audience-chamber or on the way thither. Moreover, it is dramatically desirable that the audience should know that Diana has seen Parolles, in view of her reliance upon his testimony. As for the second argument, it has already been pointed out that exits are frequently omitted from the stage-directions, especially where some speech acts as a cue for the actor's departure.⁴ Such a cue, in the writer's opinion, exists in the

⁴ Another instance in which two directions for the entrance of the same

present instance. Parolles has been led to enter the audience-chamber on the heels of Diana, out of curiosity, but in his new-born spirit of humility he remains on the fringe of the crowd near one of the entrances. When he hears Diana name him as a witness he realizes his awkward predicament and slips hastily out of the door, unobserved by the characters on the stage, but not by the audience. The situation affords one of the few opportunities for laughter in the course of the sordid exposure of Bertram's baseness.

Yale University.

ARTHUR E. CASE.

A NOTE ON RABELAIS I, 1

A passage near the end of the first chapter of Rabelais's *Gargantua* tells how the genealogy of the hero was discovered. In a great tomb of bronze, accidentally uncovered by ditch-diggers, was found the said genealogy, "escripte au long de lettres cancelleresques, non en papier, non en parchemin, non en cere, mais en écorce d'ulmeau." The only source for this episode indicated by the notes in the critical edition,¹ are passages from Folengo and Pliny. I suggest as an alternative source the *Prologus* to the *Ephemeris* of Dictys Cretensis, which tells how this work was deciphered from a manuscript accidentally discovered when the author's tomb was rent open by an earthquake.

Dictys was fabled to have written his account of the Trojan War upon *tiliae*, that is upon strips of bast, the inner bark of the lime tree, a substance familiar to the ancients under the names of *tilia* and *philyra*; the word *tilias* occurs three times in the *Prologus*, and affords a parallel to Rabelais's "écorce d'ulmeau" which the passages in Folengo and Pliny² do not offer. But

character occur without any intervening direction for his exit will be found in the same scene. Bertram obviously is led from the stage at line 127, although the Folio does not say so, and a direction for his second entrance occurs at line 153. (It is postponed until line 155 in most modern editions.)

¹ *Oeuvres de François Rabelais, édition critique*, T. I. *Gargantua*, Paris, Champion, 1912, pp. 23, 24.

² Pliny, *N. H.*, XIII, 21 (69), states that paper was once made from the bark of certain trees, but does not mention any special variety of tree.

why, if Rabelais had the Dictys episode in mind, did he speak of elm bark rather than linden bark? Here is a possible explanation. In the twenty-fourth book of Pliny's *Natural History*, which deals with the medicinal virtues of plants and trees, occurs a passage in which the word *tilia*, in the generalized sense of "inner bark," is used of the inner bark of the elm.³ The peculiar sense which the word here bears is borne in upon the reader by the fact that the very next section proceeds to describe the properties of the lime tree, and opens with the words "Arbor tilia."⁴ A person who had recently read or carefully studied the twenty-fourth book of Pliny, and only such a person, would not unnaturally interpret the *tiliae* of Dictys as elm bark.

Rabelais, as an enthusiastic student of medicine, is almost certain to have read the passage in Pliny; as a humanist he is extremely likely to have known his Dictys, whom contemporary scholarship regarded as an important historian, "luculentum historiographum," to quote the words of François Faragonius in the preface of his 1499 edition.⁵ Accordingly the words "écorce d'ulmeau" furnish a presumption that the prologue to Dictys is a real source of the episode at the beginning of the *Gargantua*.

University of Buffalo.

G. H. GIFFORD.

MILTON AND WALTON'S *BIBLIA SACRA POLYGLOTTA* (1657)

There have been numerous attempts made in the past to connect Milton with that prodigious Polyglot Bible, edited by Brian Walton, which appeared at London in 1657 after years of labor on the part of its editor. All of these attempts have pointed out that if a connection existed between Milton and this mighty work of English scholarship, it would have important consequences. Saurat especially has made the connection with this Bible of great

³ Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, xxiv, 8 (33), 48.—*Ulmi et folia et cortex et rami vim habent spissandi et volnera contrahendi. Corticis utique interior tilia lepras sedat.* . . .

⁴ *Ibid.*, xxiv, 8 (34), 49.

⁵ See N. E. Griffin, *Dares and Dictys* . . . (Baltimore, J. H. Furst Co., 1907), pp. 14-17.

importance in providing Milton with a text of the Aramaic Targumim and other Oriental Biblical texts.¹ But conclusive proof of the connection has been lacking. It is hoped to provide it here.

I have cited elsewhere some evidences of Milton's actual employment of this Bible,² but there remains a most remarkable reference to the Polyglot by Milton, the explanation of which, on the one hand, furnishes direct evidence of his actual usage and citation of Walton, and on the other, explains a century-old perplexity concerning one of his versional citations.

This reference occurs in the chapter *de Filio Dei* of the *de doctrina Christiana*, where Milton commented length upon Acts 20:28. Concerning the generally accepted *ecclesiam Dei* (Church of God) of this verse he wrote:

Verum Syriac versio non *Dei*, sed *Christi ecclesiam* scribit;
ut nostra recens *Domini ecclesiam*.³

The reference to *recens nostra* puzzled Sumner greatly, and in his English translation, to which rather than to the Latin text he appended his notes and critical apparatus, he indicated in a footnote that he took this to be a recent English Biblical version.⁴ He referred to editions of the sixteenth century, but surely these would not have been mentioned by Milton as *recens*.

¹ Saurat, Denis, *Milton; Man and Thinker*, N. Y., 1925, pp. 252-53. "He had at his disposal the Polyglot Bible published by Walton in 1657." Saurat advances no proof whatsoever for this statement.

² Fletcher, H. F., *Milton's Semitic Studies*, Chicago, 1926, p. 84.

³ *De doctrina Christiana*, ed. Charles Sumner, London, 1825, p. 82.

⁴ *Prose Works of John Milton*, Bohn edition, iv, p. 112, note 8. "In the list of various readings given in Bp. Wilson's Bible, it is stated that the reading of *the Lord* exists in one of the English Bibles printed by Whitechurch, which was probably the 'recent translation' alluded to by Milton. This printer published many editions of the Bible, separately or in conjunction with Grafton, about the middle of the sixteenth century. The library of St. Paul's contains ten editions published in different years between 1530 and 1560, but the reading alluded to appears in none of them. The libraries of the British Museum, Lambeth, and Canterbury (which latter collection contains about fifty ancient English Bibles and Testaments presented by the late Dr. Coombe) the Bodleian library at Oxford, the University library, and the libraries of Trinity and St. John's Colleges, Cambridge, have also been searched without success for a copy of the edition in question."

Sumner's work as editor, translator, and annotator was of such a profound nature, as his note indicates, that one hesitates to charge him with error or misunderstanding, but in this particular instance it seems clear that his fundamental assumption was false. As his note states, he inferred that Milton was referring to a recent English version of the Bible. This, however, is unwarranted on two counts. Milton was referring in the first part of his statement to the standard translation of the Syriac, and the mere fact that he was writing in Latin would lead one to infer that he was referring to a Latin translation and not an English. Moreover, the Syriac Testament is fragmentary and therefore seldom if ever published in English translation. The standard form in which it usually appeared was as a Latin translation of those portions of the New Testament found in the Syriac, supplemented, as in Tremellius' various editions by excerpts from Beza and other Latin translations of those parts missing in the Syriac. Milton was therefore presumably referring to the standard Latin Translation of the Syriac, for him the translation of Tremellius done in 1569 at Paris, in the first part of his statement regarding the Syriac, and to some other recent Latin translation of the Syriac for the second part. This is significant, for while Biblical versions in the Western World have multiplied from Jerome to Goodspeed, translations of the Syriac New Testament have not been numerous, and especially in Milton's day would have been of great interest to a man of sound and wide linguistic training who was penning a system of theology based on Scripture.

Instead, therefore, of having hunted for an English Biblical version in which the reading was *Lord*, Sumner should have hunted for a recent translation of the Syriac, probably done in Latin, in which the word **ܡܫܝܗ** (Meshiha) had been translated *Domini* or *Domino* and not *Christi*. Such a search is much simpler than Sumner's, for at the time Milton was writing⁵ there had indeed appeared a very "recent" translation of the Syriac, which was, of course, the Latin translation printed in Walton's *Polyglot* of 1657. In this translation the phrase **ܕܡܫܝܗ**

⁵ Hanford, J. H., *Studies in Philology*, xvii, 309 ff., *The Date of Milton's de doctrina Christiana*. Hanford concludes that the work was written between 1655 and 1660.

ܡܫܝܗ (Church of the Meshiha) is rendered *ecclesiam illam Domino*, which Milton has changed by the simple expedient of changing the dative of reference or possession, *Domino*, to the genitive *Domini*. So nearly does the date of Walton's work agree with the most carefully considered dating, between 1655 and 1660, of the final composition of the *de doctrina*, that Milton's pointing out the use of the word *Dominus* in place of *Christus* is very striking indication of what he meant by *recens*.

The "recent translation," therefore, would appear, on the dual basis of proximity in time and agreement of citation, to have been the translation of the Syriac in Walton's *Polyglot* of 1657, which quite clearly demonstrates that Milton employed this Bible.

University of Illinois.

HARRIS FLETCHER.

SHAKESPEARE MISQUOTED

When Polonius says of Hamlet,

I am sorry that with better heed and judgment
I had not quoted him,

he prophesies concerning the critics to come. Shakespearean style may profitably be studied through misquotations. One of the chief modern sinners is Hazlitt, in spite of the fact that he is one of the best of Shakespearean critics. Whenever he quotes a brief passage, he apparently relies on his memory and does not verify. Hence, although he himself is an admirable stylist in prose, he frequently substitutes a poorer word or phrase for Shakespeare's. He has naively confessed his own faults in a passage from his essay *On Application to Study*, in his volume *The Plain Speaker*:

If any person is trying to recollect a favorite line, and cannot hit upon some particular expression, it is in vain to think of substituting any other so good. . . . I was at a loss the other day for the line in *Henry V*,

Nice customs curtesy to great kings.

I could not recollect the word *nice*: I tried a number of others, such as *old*, *grave*, etc.—they would none of them do, but seemed all heavy, lumbering, or from the purpose. . . . Again—

A jest's *prosperity* lies in the ear
Of him that hears it.

I thought of quoting from memory, of "A jest's *success*," "A jest's *renown*," etc. I then turned to the volume, and there found the very word that of all others expressed the idea.

He then proceeds, in the essay *On the Difference Between Writing and Speaking*, in the same volume, to misquote *Henry V* most vilely:

Hear him but reason in divinity,
And, all-admiring, with an inward wish
You would desire that he were made a prelate.
Let him but talk of any state-affair,
You'd say it had been all in all his study.
Turn him to any cause of policy,
The Gordian knot of it he will unloose,
Familiar as his garter. When he speaks,
The air, a charter'd libertine, stands still. (I, 1, 38)

Here is the correct quotation, with the variants italicised:

Hear him but reason in divinity,
And all-admiring with an inward wish
You would desire *the king* were made a prelate:
Hear him *debate* of *commonwealth* affairs,
You *would* say it *hath* been all in all his study:
.
Turn him to any cause of policy,
The Gordian knot of it he will unloose,
Familiar as his garter: *that*, when he speaks,
The air, a charter'd libertine, *is* still.

Of some of Hazlitt's mistakes one may say, with Master Page of the *Merry Wives*, "This passes!" Or, as Sir Hugh Evans adds, "Indeed, Master Ford, this is not well, indeed." The phrase "talk of any state-affair" is weak when compared with the right Shakespeare of "debate of commonwealth affairs."

Perhaps in the following line Hazlitt was deliberately altering:

This, this is the unkindest cut of all.
(*On the Jealousy and the Spleen of Party:*
The Plain Speaker)

The repetition of the word *this* is not un-Shakespearean; and to the modern reader Hazlitt's line may be preferable to the old grammar of

This was the most unkindest cut of all.
(*Julius Caesar*, III, 2, 187)

But in this passage from *Antony and Cleopatra* (iv, 14, 9) he jumbles the blank verse lines and imports into one of them two words, "a bear, a cloud," which occur separately seven and eight lines above, respectively. Here is his version:

That which was now a horse, a bear, a cloud,
Even with a thought the rack dislimns,
And makes it indistinct as water is in water.

(*On Dreams: The Plain Speaker*)

Shakespeare says:

Sometime we see a cloud that's dragonish,
A vapour sometime like a bear or lion.

That which is now a horse, even with a thought
The rack dislimns and makes it indistinct
As water is in water.

Hazlitt, like Antigonus, fled from the bear for seven pentameter measures and then admitted him without disturbing the meter. But what a blank verse line is

And makes it indistinct as water is in water!

Where was Hazlitt's ear? We shall have to admit that this is a comedy of metrical errors.

In his volume, *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*, he quotes accurately almost always, doubtless because he had the text before him. Yet even here he slips occasionally, as when, in the essay on *Othello*, he writes

I *felt* not Cassio's kisses on her lips,

where Shakespeare wrote *found*, a much finer word, indeed an almost inspired one. Equally bad is Hazlitt's rendering, in a footnote of his essay on *Hamlet*, of the famous

There is a willow grows aslant a brook,
That shows his hoar leaves in the glassy stream.

(iv, 7, 167)

He turns it into

There is a willow growing o'er a brook
That shows its hoary leaves i' th' glassy stream.

How could he miss the picturesque and unusual word *aslant*?

And why did he ruin Shakespeare's concord of sweet sounds by making a hash of the second line? Reverence, "that angel of the world," should have prevented him. His third offence, in this volume, this time in an essay on *The Merchant of Venice*, is a mangling of the great passage from *Hamlet*:

'Tis an unweeded garden
That grows to seed; things rank and gross in nature
Possess it merely. (I, 2, 135)

The Hazlittian hash for this is: "'Tis an unweeded garden; things rank and gross do merely gender in it!" Shakespeare does not use the word *gender* in the whole of this long soliloquy. I fear that Hazlitt's love for the great poet is here merely such as "the general gender bear him."

In *Table-Talk*, one of his most delightful volumes, Hazlitt misquotes in the third essay, *On Genius and Common Sense*, another *Hamlet* passage. He makes it: "There's the rub that makes absurdity of so long life." Admitting that he may have intended the variant *absurdity*, for *calamity*, he certainly did not intend *rub*, for *respect*. And he alters the meter:

There's the respect
That makes calamity of so long life. (III, 1, 68)

In *The Ignorance of the Learned*, a devastating attack on pedants, he fails to show some of the "exact scholarship" which is the redeeming feature of pedants. He writes: "I would rather be a wood cutter, or the meanest hind, that all day 'sweats in the eye of Phoebus, and at night sleeps in Elysium,' than wear out my life so, 'twixt dreaming and awake." Shakespeare wrote:

From the rise to set
Sweats in the eye of Phoebus, and all night
Sleeps in Elysium. (Henry V, iv, 1, 257)

The superiority of "all night" over "at night" needs no comment. Hazlitt's feeble substitute arose from his having missed "from rise to set," for which he tried to make his "all day" do service. But such a substitute is like Falstaff's soldiers, "exceeding poor and bare, too beggarly." And if Hazlitt should answer, "Tut, tut; mortal phrases, mortal phrases," we should be tempted

to counter with "Immortal phrases in Shakespeare, mortal in Hazlitt."

The admirable speech in *All's Well That Ends Well* (iv, 3, 83), "The web of our life is of a mingled yarn, good and ill together; our virtues would be proud, if our faults whipt them not; and our crimes would despair if they were not cherished by our virtues," is turned by our critic into this:

The web of our *lives* is of mingled yarn, good and ill together; our virtues would be proud, if our faults whipt them not; and our *vices* would despair, if they were not *encouraged* by our virtues.

(Quoted in *Why Distant Objects Please: Table-Talk*)

Here Hazlitt misses the alliteration of *crimes* and *cherished*. Moreover, Shakespeare's word *cherished* is much more expressive than *encouraged*. Whether our critic's next blunder, in the essay *Whether Actors Ought To Sit in the Boxes*, is a vice or a crime and whether it should be cherished or whipped, I shall leave to the reader to determine:

No; let him pass. Vex not his parting spirit,
Nor on the rack of this rough world
Stretch him out farther!

This is the correct text:

O, let him pass! Vex not his ghost: he hates him
That would upon the rack of this tough world
Stretch him out longer. (King Lear, v, 3, 313)

"Parting spirit" is not bad; it shows a pretty vein of invention in Hazlitt. And his use of *rough* for *tough* would be understandable if he lived in the present age and wished to avoid the reminiscence of Vachel Lindsay's lines, from his poem *How Samson Bore Away the Gates of Gaza*,

But he wept—"I must not love tough queens,
Nor spend on them my hard earned means."

When we pass to Hazlitt's *Sketches and Essays*, we reach one of his most poetic and memorable efforts, *On a Sun-Dial*. There is little better writing in English prose. Take a passage almost at random:

Surely nothing is more simple than time. His march is straightforward;

but we should have leisure allowed us to look back upon the distance we have come, and not be counting his steps every moment. Time in Holland is a foolish old fellow with all the antics of a youth, who "goes to church in a coranto, and lights his pipe in a cinque-pace."

I scratch my head and wonder, "Did Shakespeare refer to pipes or to tobacco elsewhere in his works—or even here, in *Twelfth Night*?" And then I look up the passage and find Sir Toby, that sad rascal, saying in his vulgar fashion:

Why dost thou not go to church in a galliard and come home in a coranto? . . . I would not so much as make water but in a cinque-pace.

(I, 3, 135)

No, Sir Toby was not lighting his pipe; he was but "looking upon the hedge," like Autolycus.

In the same volume, *Sketches and Essays*, Hazlitt writes of *Disagreeable People*—with whom he evidently contrasts good old Izaak Walton in the following passage: "I am not sure that Walton's *Angler* is not a book of this last description—

That dallies with the innocence of thought,
Like the old time."

It is an admirable comment. But Shakespeare, in *Twelfth Night* (II, 4, 49) wrote:

It is silly sooth,
And dallies with the innocence of love
Like the old age.

In the essay *On Taste*, Hazlitt says: "In Shakespeare's description of flowers, primroses are mentioned—

That come before the swallow dares, and take
The winds of March with beauty."

And he adds: "I will be bold to say that there will be no scruple entertained whether this single metaphor does not contain more poetry of the kind than is to be found in all Racine." Hazlitt's praise is probably not excessive. But Shakespeare wrote of daffodils, not of primroses. It is a little below, in the same passage, that he speaks of

Pale primroses,
That die unmarried, ere they can behold
Bright Phoebus in his strength.

(*The Winter's Tale*, iv, 4, 122)

In *The Spirit of the Age* we find in the essay *Rev. Mr. Irving* this misquotation from *The Tempest*: "He could bedim the noon-day sun, betwixt the green sea and the azure vault set roaring war." Compare the true version:

I have bedimm'd
The *noontide* sun, call'd forth the mutinous winds,
And 'twixt the green sea and the *azur'd* vault
Set roaring war. (v, 1, 41)

Hazlitt's *azure* is commonplace beside Shakespeare's *azur'd*.

It is in his masterpiece of satire, *A Letter to William Gifford, Esq.*, printed in *The Spirit of the Age*, that Hazlitt telescopes two lines of a famous sonnet (No. 116) thus:

Love is not love that alteration finds.

Shakespeare's version is:

Love is not love
Which alters when it alteration finds.

Here the sense is considerably different. It is a kind of mistake that Hazlitt seldom makes. In the essay *On Poetry in General*, published in *The English Poets*, he returns to his trick of distorting meter:

The mortal instruments are then in council;
And the state of man like to a little kingdom,
Suffers then the nature of an insurrection.

Compare the original:

The *genius* and the mortal instruments
Are then in council; and the state of *man*,
Like to a little kingdom, suffers then
The nature of an insurrection. (*Julius Caesar*, II, 1, 63)

Hazlitt's omission of three words in the first line forced him to reconstruct the entire metrical scheme of the passage. And he failed to note that *insurrection* has here five syllables. Indeed, his last line is lame, however we try to scan it.

One of his most perverse changes occurs in the discussion of *Posthumous Fame*, in his early book, *The Round Table*. In quoting Sonnet No. 111, he inserts the exact opposite of Shakespeare's word:

Oh! for my sake do you with Fortune chide,
The guilty goddess of my *harmless* deeds.

The correct reading is *harmful*. And this is the only mistake Hazlitt makes in quoting a passage of seven lines. It is almost inexplicable.

I fear this list of misquotations will cloud the fame of a great critic. Let me say, therefore, that Hazlitt is so felicitous in his use of Shakespearean quotations that, even when he misquotes, he is never "less than archangel ruined." As compared with most other critics, he is "in shape and gesture proudly eminent." His faults are slight, his virtues many and great. And at his worst as at his best, to vary Shakespeare's characterization of Brutus, "he will be found like Hazlitt, like himself." Phrases he may quote, but ideas he does not borrow. The justice and eloquence of his paragraph, "It is we who are Hamlet," has never been surpassed. He is one of the most penetrating, as he is one of the most fascinating, of Shakespearean critics.

Goucher College.

HARRY T. BAKER.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF ACTS III AND IV OF *THE QUEEN OF CORINTH*

Some time ago I had occasion to investigate carefully both the known work of Nathaniel Field and the work in the disputed plays of the Beaumont and Fletcher canon. At that time I came to the conclusion that Field had written not only the Induction to the *Four Plays in One* but also the whole of the *Triumph of Honour* and the *Triumph of Love*. I have been much interested to find that Mr. H. Dugdale Sykes in his article, "Nathaniel Field's Work in the Beaumont and Fletcher's Plays" in *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama* confirms my opinion, but I must take exception to the proof of authorship used by Mr. Sykes. Mr. Sykes asserts that Field wrote the two Triumphs and Acts III and IV of *The Queen of Corinth*. He feels that Field was the author of the Triumphs because of their similarity to the two acts in *The Queen of Corinth*. His proof of authorship consists of what seem to me some very unconvincing parallels between passages in *The Queen of Corinth* and

passages in the two Triumphs, and one passage in *Amends for Ladies*. A careful examination shows that the salient characteristics of Field, the characteristics which are so marked in *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies* and which are present in the Induction, and the two Triumphs, are absent in Acts III and IV of *The Queen of Corinth*.

Field's chief characteristics are more numerous than Mr. Sykes has suspected. There are other things than Field's free use of rimed couplets to indicate his work. His dramatic method is one clue. He uses few scenes, one or more sub-plots, plunges immediately into the action of the play, and maintains a rapidity of movement throughout; these are all traits one might expect from an experienced actor. In diction he uses large, mouthfilling words, always preferring the long word of Latin origin to its simpler Anglo-Saxon equivalent. There is the frequent use of alliteration in his verse. His blank verse is labored, but regular. He sometimes had to force his lines to do it, but he generally comes out with five regular feet, and pauses at the end of the line. As a result he has a low percentage of double-endings and of run-on lines. His average is about 14% double-endings and 20% run-on lines. His use of rimes is frequent. He uses them in the conventional manner before exits and at the end of scenes, but he has one other use which is distinctly his own. He sometimes uses a couplet as the cue for the entrance of an important character, an effective device which he no doubt learned from his own experience on the stage. Again Field will use rime when he is in a facetious mood. His work is also characterized by the use of satire. He satirizes the lightness of women in a bitter, vindictive fashion, and frequently turns his invective against current social abuses. These, then, are the characteristics of Field's own work, the work in *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies*. What happens if we apply these tests to Acts III and IV of *The Queen of Corinth*?

In the first place, the diction is not that of Field. In all the third act there are only four words which suggest Field: *disproportion*, *ignominious*, *excruciate*, and *antipathous*; in the fourth act there are none. There is little of Field's tendency to alliteration (Sykes gives one example) or to play on words in these acts. There is none of his roistering comedy, or his satire, and the Field

attitude toward women is lacking. More than this, the verse is not that of Field. With the exception of one scene (IV, III) the percentage of double-endings is too high; in this scene it is as low as 12%, which is within his range.¹ The verse has none of the regularity of Field's. There are many parts of lines thrown in, and there are still other lines which have far too many syllables. In fact, there are in these two acts lines with triple and quadruple endings, lines unlike any in Field's accredited work. Much of the verse in Acts III and IV cannot be distinguished from prose. Field's verse always keeps the steady, regular beat of blank verse.

The very traits by which Field may be recognized, and the traits which are conclusively present in the Induction and the two Triumphs, are not to be found at all in Acts III and IV of *The Queen of Corinth*. So lacking in Field characteristics are these parts that a first reading of the disputed acts gave me the impression that Field did not write them, and each reading since has increased that impression until I am convinced that whoever may have written the third and fourth acts of *The Queen of Corinth*, Field did not.

Stanford University.

FRANK L. FENTON.

¹ Technical Table of Acts III and IV of *The Queen of Corinth*:

III, I: 249 lines of verse
61 double-endings, 20%
65 run-on lines, 26%
III, II: 130 lines of verse
21 double-endings, 16%
34 run-on lines, 26%
IV, I: 170 lines of verse
68 double-endings, 40%
40 run-on lines, 23%
IV, II: 32 lines of verse
8 double-endings, 25%
14 run-on lines, 43%
IV, III: 150 lines of verse
18 double-endings, 12%
42 run-on lines, 28%
IV, IV: 131 lines of verse
35 double-endings, 26%
28 run-on lines, 21%

THE NEW SAINTE-BEUVE MATERIAL

Sainte-Beuve continues to receive the respectful attention of scholars, as numerous special articles, and various new editions of his works, show,¹ yet in the case of the fresh material, now published by M. Giraud² in a book which is provoking wide discussion, the judgment of the critic is sharply questioned. Very interrogative is M. Giraud himself, whose choice of title (*Mes Poisons*) indicates that he regards these intimate notes as essentially venomous (*i. e. not judicious*). Sainte-Beuve, we are told, was nervous, irascible, suspicious, spiteful, jealous, and full of bile. Now is there any evidence that even when dealing with his contemporaries, he retains a modicum of wisdom? What beside venom?

S.-B. is impersonal, for he himself remarks in this book (p. 128) that the critic's gift amounts to genius when, in the midst of revolutions in taste, he discerns clearly, *sans aucune mollesse*, what is good. It might have been added that a man determined to judge his fellows without softness easily grows dour, the neighbors contributing. S.-B. in fact becomes an artist in acerbity, yet one cannot fail to observe that the malice is wholesale. It comes, I think, of a philosophy which is finding in the nineteenth century an alien quality that provokes constant expostulation.

There is a clue to this philosophy in a stricture about Dumas to the effect that his imagination represents merely "une prodigieuse dépense d'esprits animaux" (p. 29). S.-B. italicizes an objection to the merely physical in literature to which he often returns. There is a further reference to Dumas, and to Balzac, as judged by Hugo, where the critic suggests that their power is chiefly "une je ne sais quelle force purement robuste de santé et de tempérament" (p. 50). Likewise, tempering his praise of

¹ Cf. Brémond, "U. Guttinguer et le Roman de S.-B.," *Rddm*, Nov. 1, 1925; Gazier, "Les 'Sources' de S.-B.," *RB*, 1926, no. 14; MacClintock, "S.-B. and Pope," *PMLA*, June, 1926; Henriot, "Un peu de lumière sur 'Volupté,'" *Temps*, Oct. 19, 1926; the new ed. of *Port-Royal*, Paris, A la Connaissance, 1926; a new collection of the essays, Paris, La Ren. du Livre, 1926; *Quelques figures de l'histoire*, Paris, Tallandier, 1926.

² *Mes Poisons*, Cahiers intimes inédits, Paris, 1926. First published in *Rddm*, Dec. 15, 1925, Jan. 15, Feb. 1, 1926. Cf. Thibaudet, "Amis et Ennemis de S.-B.," *NRF*, Aug. 1, 1926.

Musset, he protests that "en fait de passion, on ne discerne en ce temps-ci que les gens qui crient à se tordre les entrailles" (p. 105); and he points out in another connection that there are innumerable degrees of craft more compatible with human nature than grossness. "Ulysse, quoiqu'il fasse, est un homme; Polyphème est un animal" (p. 38). For him the gusto of the vigorous must have *direction*. In the passage where he objects, apropos of Dumas, Balzac, and Hugo, to the merely robust he praises *la véritable puissance de l'esprit*, and asks: "Lequel a plus de valeur, Gengiskan traînant à sa suite toutes les hordes d'Asie, ou M. de Turenne à la tête de trente mille hommes?"³ He deplores the lack of proportion (absence of control) shown by Hugo before the academy; the speaker had not the measure of the place, his speech was Cyclopean (compare "Polyphemus is an animal"). Immense unconnected fragments. Only those who have more imagination than good sense and intellect admire. S.-B. is using the word imagination as Pascal did when the latter wrote of "cette partie décevante de l'homme . . . ennemie de la raison,"⁴ and similarly prefers a quality of mind.⁵ He objects likewise to the lack of intellectual direction of Lamartine as a historian,⁶ and one finds further implication in favor of control in the remark, apropos of the violence of Musset, that there may be more anguish in a sigh than in a shriek.⁷ This principle of control and proportion, the critic had previously made clear,⁸ should help a man keep his place in the cosmos.⁹ He now objects in the same spirit to *plénitude de soi-même*,¹⁰ and says it is of his essence to be the one *qui voit en petit* and not to esteem *celui qui voit gros*. He actively hates the poseur who calculates even his *bonjour* (p. 49). He flays Hugo on this score (p. 48) and indulges in sharp criticism, as

³ P. 50. Cf. *Portraits Littéraires*, III, 547.

⁴ *Œuvres*, ed. Grands Écrivains, XIII, 1-2.

⁵ Cf. p. 88: "l'abus de la phrase . . . le strict nécessaire de la pensée."

⁶ P. 83. Cf. p. 81, of *les Girondins*: "Je ne dirai pas que ce livre émeut, mais il émotionne. Mauvais mot, mauvaise chose."

⁷ P. 103. S.-B. quotes Dollfus.

⁸ In *Chateaubriand et son Groupe*. Cf. H. E. Smith, "S.-B.'s Chateaubriand," *FQ*, June, 1926.

⁹ Gide, *Incidences*, Paris, Nouvelle Revue Française, 1924, Appendice, argues that the true classicist is modest.

¹⁰ P. 66. of Guizot. Cf. p. 39.

indeed Guizot and Royer-Collard do, of the arrogance of Lamartine (p. 86).

The "naïvely self-important" Lamartine (p. 79), it is furthermore stated, descends to mere rhetoric (p. 88), and this attaches the problem of pose to the problem of integrity, as S.-B. had combined these when he deprecated the gulf between what the author of the *Itinéraire* did and what in beautiful words he said. Now he regrets that George Sand should write on the same day the most admirable pages since Rousseau and an ignoble letter. What is a talent that may be so corrupted? (p. 108). Now this cannot be on the part of S.-B. mere Puritanism. In the pulpit, as he is well aware, he would be a sorry figure, but he does worship taste as the equivalent in literature of a true sense of the Christian in religion;¹¹ he now quotes Vauvenargues to the effect that to have *taste* one must have a *soul* (p. 53); and then we find this quotation: "Le vers se sent toujours des bassesses du cœur" (p. 51). Once more he looks at Hugo. But he is completely impersonal when, in another part of the book, referring to *ces derniers temps*, he protests vigorously against the subordination of truth to declamation (pp. 23-24). He has turned to a line from Boileau for support as to that sense of proportion which produces integrity. The same predilection for the earlier period underlies a remark, not in the least querulous, that one of the terms particularly applicable to the talents of his contemporaries is *prodigious*; he points out how impossible it would be to say this of Corneille, Pascal, and Racine (p. 28).

In the notes of self-appraisal in *Mes Poisons* S.-B. writes that he is *classique* in the sense that a certain degree of unreason and bad taste forever spoils a book for him (p. 11). He has plead previously for a "liberal classicism."¹² No doubt all -isms are hateful. Yet a scholar so gifted in nuances as M. Cazamian has proposed¹³ to look at the history of literature in France and elsewhere as the history of two tendencies, one somehow allied to classicism, the other to romanticism; he feels he is in the presence of phenomena complicated yet reducible in essence to two terms.

¹¹ *Port-Royal*, 3e éd., I, 417.

¹² *Causeries du Lundi*, III, 38-55.

¹³ Louis Cazamian, *La Notion de Retours Périodiques dans l'Histoire Littéraire*, Annales de l'Université de Paris, Mars, 1926.

The present *cahiers* of S.-B. suggest a characteristic rhythm in his thinking, which would place him as an observer of the revolution in taste of his own time who is judging that revolution in terms of its opposite and "without softness."¹⁴ He is elusive; one may question the widespread view that he is "the wandering Jew of the intellectual world" and yet not deny that he is errant and crotchety. But it has been recently pointed out¹⁵ that the seventeenth century itself was far from living up to its own standard. S.-B. himself was, I think, guilty of unreason and, in the acerbity of some of the present notes, without taste. Yet, after examination of the evidence, I cannot believe that he is exclusively or primarily what the title suggests, poisonous. If he attacks, it is in the name of the truth as he sees it. *In veneno veritas.*

Brown University.

HORATIO SMITH.

THE MEANING OF THE WORD "DADE."

No group of authors have ever received less attention in proportion to the volume of their printed work than have the almanack-makers of the seventeenth century. Our ignorance of these men has led to a curious mistake, which was, I believe, first made in Halliwell and Wright's edition of Nare's *Glossary*, and has since been repeated in the *New English Dictionary*. In these works the word "dade" is defined as a kind of "wading bird." This curious word occurs only in Song XX of a seventeenth century volume of verse, known as *The Loyal Garland*, of which the fifth and only extant edition appeared in 1686. The first two stanzas of this song are as follows:

What *Booker* doth prognosticate
Concerning kings or kingdoms state,
I think myself to be as wise

¹⁴ Cf. Seillière's *Sainte-Beuve, Agent, Juge, et Complice de l'Évolution Romantique*, Paris, 1921. Had he been able to examine the present material, he might have given more emphasis to S.-B. as a *judge* of romanticism.

¹⁵ Cf. *RHL*, xxxiii, 116, a review by M. Mornet of Gaiiffe, *L'Envers du Grand Siècle*.

As some that gazeth on the skyes:
My skill goes beyond the depth of a *pond*,
Or *rivers* in the greatest rain,
Whereby I can tell, all things will be well,
When the king enjoys his own again.

There's neither *swallow*, *dove*, nor *dade*,
Can soar more high, or deeper wade;
Nor shew a reason from the stars,
What causeth peace or civil wars:
The man in the moon may wear out his shoo'n
By running after Charles his wain,
But all's to no end, for the times will not mend
Till the king &c.,

I have reproduced these stanzas exactly as they appear in the reprint made by the Percy Society,¹ except that I have taken the liberty of italicizing certain words. Unfortunately I have not seen a copy of the original volume, which is very scarce, but it seems highly probable that in the original edition these words were both italicized and capitalized, as was customary in the printing of the day. The Percy Society has obviously not reproduced the text, but has on the contrary modernized the spelling and the printing.

To a seventeenth century reader the meaning of this poem was obvious. The author was not talking of birds; he was referring to well-known almanack-makers of the day. Of those mentioned probably John Booker was the most famous,² but not the least among their brethren were the Dades, John and William. The first extant almanack bearing the name of John Dade was published in 1589 and the last in 1616. He probably published annually, although no almanacks are extant for several of the intervening years. In 1619 we find that William Dade, who for lack of better information, may be called John's son, was publishing an almanack under his own name. The last almanack extant under his name was published in 1694. Hence Dade's Almanack was a well-known institution for over a century. The other men mentioned in this poem were equally famous. Pond's almanack was published annually from 1604 to 1709, River's from

¹ Vol. XXIX.

² See the *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* for an account of Booker.

1626 to 1640, Swallow's from 1634 to 1742, and Dove's from 1627 to 1709.

Consequently one is forced to assume that it is very unlikely that there was ever a word "dade" meaning a wading bird, especially as this word occurs only in a place where the reference is obviously to well-known astrologers.

Yale University.

JOSEPH TOY CURTISS.

ON THE BODY AND SOUL LEGEND

In the well-known moral play, *The Castell of Perseverance*, there occurs a version of the so-called *Debate between Body and Soul*, which, I believe, has not been noted by students of the legend. Ramsay in the introduction to his edition of Skelton's *Magnyfycence* (E. E. T. S. Extra Series No. xcvi, p. cxlviii) points out that it has been commonly supposed that the prologue to the *Pride of Life* indicates that the motif of the *Debate of Body and Soul* was employed in the second part of that morality. He further writes, "If the old soul and body motif, as Brandl surmises (*Q. and F.* 2, LXXX, p. xviii), did appear in the closing part, we have lost the only known example of its dramatic use." (P. clxiv.)

Notwithstanding Ramsay's assertion, the speeches of Anima, at least, in *The Castell of Perseverance* seem clearly a survival of the old body and soul motif. To be sure the upbraiding of the body by the soul is more curtailed than are the upbraidings in the well-known poetic versions such as those in the Vercelli Book and Wright's collection.¹ However, the speeches in the morality preserve much of the spirit of those in the poetic versions.

According to stage directions (Macro Plays: E. E. T. S. Extra Series, p. 168, l. 3008) *Anima* enters from beneath the bed under the castle immediately after *Humanum Genus* dies. Presumably the corpse is lying upon the bed, since the death occurs upon the stage and there is no direction for an exit. *Anima* speaks as follows:

Mercy, þis was my last tale
þat euere my body was abowth.

¹ Grein Bibl., *A. S. Poesie*, I, p. 198 ff., and Wright, *Latin Poems of W. Mapes*, p. 179 ff., p. 321 ff.

but Mercy helpe me in þis vale,
 of dampnyng drynke, sore I me doute.
 body! þou dedyst brew a byttyr bale,
 to þi lustys whanne gannyst loute,
 þi sely sowle schal ben a-kale;
 I beye þi dedys with rewly route;
 & al it is for gyle.
 euere þou hast be coveytows
 falsly to getyn londe & hows;
 to me þou hast brokyn a byttyr jows.
 so welaway þe whyle!

(Ll. 3009-3021).

Anima then turns to *Bonus Angelus* and asks how the soul may be saved. He feels that there may be some hope since, in the last hour, *Humanum Genus* called upon God's mercy. (Ll. 3021-3030.) After this stanza a break occurs. The editor in a footnote says, "A leaf must be left out here corresponding to the gap after lf. 170."

The text resumes in the midst of a speech by the *Malus Angelus* who maintains that the soul "withoutyn dowte with me to hellē pytt" must go. The *Bonus Angelus* acknowledges his inability to save the soul, "Aȝeyns Coveytyse can I not telle," and departs to seek aid elsewhere. *Anima* laments anew his fate:

Alas, mercy! þou art to longe!
 of sadde sorwe now may I synge;
 holy wryt, it is ful wronge,
 but mercy pasē allē þynge.
 I am ordeyned to peynys stronge;
 In wo is dressyd myn wonnyng;
 In helle, on hokys I schal honge
 but mercy fro a wellē sprynge,
 þis deuyl wyl have me a-way.
 Weleaway! I was ful wod
 þat I forsoke myn Aungyl good,
 & with Coveytysē stod
 tyl þat day þat I schuld dey.

(Macro Plays, p. 168, ll. 3061-3073.)

The remainder of the scene, some fifty-six lines, is taken up by the *Malus Angelus* as he describes the pains which *Anima* must endure in hell. The scene closes as the *Malus Angelus* hastens to hell with *Anima* on his back.

I schol pee bere to helle
 I wyl not dwelle:
 have good day! I goo to helle. (Ll. 3066-3069).

Undoubtedly this portion of the text which follows the missing leaf is a part of the scene between *Malus Angelus*, *Bonus Angelus*, and *Anima* which began with *Anima's* first appearance. Whether the lost portion contained the Body's reply to the Soul's accusation or not, we cannot tell. It is possible that the portion which we have represents the only use made of the motif in this play. If so we have here a type of the legend which Bruce (*MLN*, v, 385 ff.) calls the *Address of the Damned Soul to its Body*. Versions of this type are frequent in Old and Middle English literature. Among poems of this type are the Old English version in the Vercelli Book (Grein, I, 198 ff.) and the two published by Wright and Morris respectively in their collections of poetry.² On the other hand the missing portion may well have contained the altercation between the body and soul as to the responsibility for the soul's state. If this be true, then *The Castell of Perseverance* furnishes a dramatic treatment of the dialogue form. The closing portion, that which follows the missing page, can easily correspond to the coming of the fiends after the soul in the poetic versions.

Because of certain resemblances between the extant portions of the play version and the dialogue form of the *Debate Between Body and Soul*, I am inclined to believe that the scene in *The Castell of Perseverance* is closer to the dialogue type than to the address form. In the address form represented by the Old English poems of the Vercelli and Exeter Books, the soul is portrayed as returning periodically to upbraid the body. In the dialogue version and in those versions which in Bruce's opinion approach the dialogue form (*MLN*, v, 385 ff.) the soul delivers its accusation of the body immediately upon leaving the body.³ As has been noted above, in the play version, the speech of *Anima* follows directly the death of *Humanum Genus*. The dialogue version

² Thos. Wright, *Religious Songs*, Percy Soc., XI, 70 ff.; Richard Morris, *O. E. Miscellany*, 168 ff.

³ *Erlanger Beiträge*, I, 1-325; *Worcester Fragment*, Haufe; Halle, 1880; R. Morris, *Old English Homilies*, II, 183. *De Sancte Andrea*.

places the emphasis upon the Soul's tortures in hell, while the address poems are much more vivid in their descriptions of the disintegration of the body. In this respect, this dramatic version is nearer to the dialogue than to the address. The Body's sins are specifically mentioned in both; hell's torments are concretely described in both. In the poetic version these details are in the form of a description which constitutes the latter part of the vision; in the play the description is made a part of the dialogue of *Malus Angelus* and constitutes the closing portion of the scene. Through this means the emotions of fear and terror of the audience are raised to the highest pitch in preparation for the climax, the dragging of terrified *Anima* off to hell. Bruce has indicated that great concreteness of detail is a characteristic of the dialogue type.⁴

As yet I am unable to point out a version in which there are sufficient parallels to indicate that the playwright had the copy in mind when he wrote his scene. There are, however, certain details in the dramatic version which are distinctive. From these I am inclined to surmise that the playwright either knew another version or wrote what is substantially another version. Specifically the sins for which condemnation comes are different in the poetic and dramatic versions. In the poetic versions pride and gluttony are chiefly emphasized. The body's propensity for riding and hunting, for fine clothes and rich food is called to mind. Even the Anglo-Norman version and Wright's No. 4 (*Latin Poems of Walter Mapes*, p. 321 ff.; p. 346 ff.) agree with the commoner versions in these details. (*Erlanger Beiträge*, I, 1-325.) In the play, in contrast, almost the whole emphasis is upon covetousness.

Furthermore the two versions, the poetic and dramatic, differ substantially in their descriptions of hell's torments. In the poems the "Thousand develene" which come to carry off the soul are described as terrible creatures with "brode bulches on here bac" and "ragged and roue and tayled." The torture of the soul with burning coals and "hote haspes" is delineated and finally it is carried off upon a saddle set with "scharpe pikes."

In the play version, on the other hand, no mention is made of the terrible devils, but the soul is to hang "on hokys in helle" and

⁴ *MLN.*, v, 385 ff.

"in bolnynage bondys brenne," "in pycke Ster, to grone and grenne," and "lye drenkelyd as a mous." (Ll. 3077-3080.) Because *Man* would not leave Coueytyse which slew his soul, *Anima* shall "be fonde to greve" and "putte in peynys plow" (ll. 3112-3113). There is no mention of the saddle and hot spurs, or the legion of grisly devils. Consequently since all the poetic versions agree very largely in these two points in regard to details and since the *Castell of Perseverance* differs so substantially, I believe the play presents a paraphrase of an unknown poetic version or that the dramatist made a version of his own.

TEMPE E. ALLISON.

University of California.

MIRA DE AMESCUA AND *LA VENTURA DE LA FEA*

In considering the paternity of *La ventura de la fea*, previously attributed to Lope, Mira de Amescua's case, in addition to arguments already advanced (*Mira de Amescua—El Arpa de Dabid—Lisardo, His Pseudonym*, Ohio State University Studies), is further supported by the very patent relationship between a passage in this play and an almost identical passage in Mira's *El esclavo del demonio*. In an editorial lapse (*op. cit.*, p. 185), this valuable point of contact has been passed over without mention. It should be noted that these two plays are of much the same period, and that, in exactly this way, Mira frequently (*op. cit.*, pp. 167, 181-2, etc.) displays his tendency to repeat an idea that has so impressed him as to persist in his artistic consciousness.

El esclavo del demonio
(before 1612)

!Qué bien un sabio ha llamado
la hermosura cosa incierta,
flor del campo, bien prestado,
tumba de huessos cubierta
con un paño de brocado!

(Ed. *Cl. Cast.*, vv. 2725-29)

La ventura de la fea
(1610-1616)

Y un cierto sabio ha llamado
la belleza sombra incierta,
tumba de huesos cubierta
con un paño de brocado.

(fol. 12v)

C. E. ANIBAL.

Ohio State University.

EUSTACHE LE NOBLE'S *LE FOURBE*

Eustache Le Noble (1643-1711), whose malversations while in public office and whose spectacular exploits while a prisoner at the Conciergerie won for him in his day an unsavory reputation, was the author of a considerable number of works, which, although now quite neglected, have no little merit and interest. His satirical dialogues and legal speeches have not been entirely unknown, but his several plays are seldom mentioned.¹

On Feb. 14, 1693, there was represented at the Théâtre français a comedy in three acts, entitled *Le Fourbe*. The Frères Parfaict report the performance laconically: "*Le Fourbe Parachevé*, comédie en trois actes, en prose d'un auteur anonyme, non imprimée, représentée une seule fois."² Notwithstanding the lack of information and the carelessness of the Frères Parfaict, who mistook the words of the secretary of the Théâtre français, who had written in his Register "*Le Fourbe, pas achevé*," for "*Le Fourbe Parachevé*," the true name of the play and its author were well known in Paris at the time, as is shown by the following lines from the pen of Gacon. On many previous occasions Gacon had exchanged incivilities with Le Noble, and he now railed at his unsuccessful comedy, giving an instructive account of the initial and only performance of *Le Fourbe*:

Ce mercenaire auteur chaussa le brodequin,
Et copiant sur soi le héros de la pièce,
Il peignit un fripon de la plus noire espèce:
Un rôle hideux irrita l'auditeur,
Au milieu du spectacle on fit taire l'auteur.³

The play seems never to have been printed and is not included in the *Oeuvres Complètes* of Le Noble.⁴ There is, however, in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, a manuscript which preserves

¹ Cf. Clément, J. M. B., *Anecdotes dramatiques*, Paris, 1775, III, 299 and the *Bibliothèque dramatique de M. de Soleinne*, nos. 1634, 1675, 3156, 3351, 3752.

² *Histoire du Théâtre français*, Paris, 1734-1749, XIII, 283.

³ *Le Poète sans Fard*, Rouen, 1698, p. 74 ff. Gacon's statement is much earlier than that of other writers.

⁴ Paris, 1718, 20 vol. in-12.

several excerpts from the comedy.⁵ These fragments give a clear idea of the nature of *Le Fourbe*, showing it to be, as Gacon says, the story of "un fripon de la plus noire espèce," and its author a most unskillful manipulator of theatrical lines and an individual well acquainted with knavery. It is to be noted that the play is in verse, and not in prose, as stated by the Frères Parfaict and Clément.⁶ The fragments do not deserve printing in toto, but the following extract from the first scene of Act I will serve as a sufficient and typical example of Le Noble's dramatic writing:

Des Guerets, procureur, parle.
 Oui, dès l'âge le plus tendre,
 Et vous n'étiez qu'enfant quand le bon maître Eloi,
 Votre oncle Sernivier, et dont j'étais le gendre,
 Vous mit pour petit clerc chez moi.

Prudotin, fourbe, solliciteur de procès.
 Fi! N'allez point fouiller des ordures si basses.

Des Guerets.
 Cela n'empêche pas qu'un carosse à six glaces,
 Tiré par deux chevaux bien étoupés, bien nourris,
 Tous les jours ne vous traîne aux yeux de tout Paris,
 Et qu'un bien apparent grossi par vos adresses
 Ne vous fasse morguer mille gueuses noblesses.

Davidson College.

GEO. B. WATTS.

UGO FOSCOLO AND AN ENGLISH MAGAZINE

In an article which appeared in the *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, Vol. XXXIII, 1924, p. 96 et seq., Signor A. Boselli dealt with a supposedly unpublished work of Ugo Foscolo, the illustrious Italian exile-poet. Signor Boselli, who entitled his discussion "Uno scritto ignorato di Ugo Foscolo," published, with comments, a printed essay found among the Foscolo autographs in the Tommasini papers of the Biblioteca Palatina, Parma, adding that it seemed impossible to discover whether or not the work was ever published by its author, although it bore every mark of having been intended for some English periodical.

As a matter of fact, this essay, "An Account of the Revolution of

⁵ Ms. 6541, fol. 251 ff.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, I, 392.

Naples during the years 1798, 1799," was published in Colburn's *New Monthly Magazine and Literary Journal* for January, 1821, and formed one of the chief attractions of the very first number to appear under the joint editorship of Thomas Campbell and Cyrus Redding. It has been overlooked by the numerous students of Foscolo's English period, probably because Foscolo did not contribute anything further to this magazine until the following year. None the less, in at least two well-known biographical works mention is made of the Italian's early collaboration with Campbell and Redding.

Cyrus Redding, in his *Fifty Years' Recollections*, Vol. II, pp. 168-171,¹ gives an account of the genesis of the *New Monthly* in the winter of 1820-21, and remarks, "I had received an introduction to Ugo Foscolo, when I came from Paris two years before. I now urged him to contribute. He sent an article on Neapolitan affairs."

In his *Literary Reminiscences and Memoirs of Thomas Campbell*, Vol. I, p. 168,² Redding is more explicit, and makes it plain that both the editors had a hand in procuring the coöperation of the gifted exile. "Campbell," he says, "had met Ugo Foscolo a day or two before, at Lord Holland's, when the magazine was spoken of as forthcoming, and Foscolo asked Campbell for a subject, but the poet could not tell of what he stood in need. Foscolo then went to work upon 'An Account of the Revolution in Naples'; he also proposed some memoirs of the less-known Italian poets, which he afterwards executed."

Foscolo's article even crossed the Atlantic within the year. I have found it reprinted, with flattering comments, in the *New York Literary Journal and Belles-Lettres Repository*, Vol. IV.³ Far from having passed unnoticed, therefore, it may be said to have attracted a good deal of attention in the English-speaking world.

ALGY S. NOAD.

McGill University.

¹ London, 1858, 3 vols.

² London, 1860, 2 vols.

³ New York, C. S. Van Winkle, 1821.

GERMAN KRIEG

Where the application of the laws of sound change¹ does not lead to the discovery of the etymology of a word, the finding of such an etymology then becomes in most cases a matter of chance.

Loan-words, if not too violently altered, are usually readily discovered as such; but often changes in these loan-words, especially when taken up into the language before or during the operation of a specific sound shift, cause them to take on the appearance of original words. And when we add to this a change, sometimes slight, in meaning and function, it is not at all strange that the word-sleuths should have oftentimes lost the scent. It was while looking up a word in Diefenbach's *Glossarium Latino-Germanicum* that I stumbled upon the etymology of *Krieg*.

In Latin the expression for a private soldier is *miles gregarius*. Later *gregarius* was used alone in the same sense (Cf. Diefenbach, p. 269). This word is derived from Latin *grex*, 'herd, troop.' *Miles* itself probably had this meaning originally (Cf. Greek *ᾠμος* 'throng, mob, multitude'; Walde, *Wörterbuch*, p. 484). The initial sonant *g* in *gregarius* was changed to the surd *k*, as for instance Latin *Graecos* became Gothic *Krēkōs*, Old High German *Kriahha*. The original *g* between vowels remained. The short *ē*² was lengthened as in the loan-word *Brief* > Lat. *brēvis*, or Old Saxon *prēstar*, OHG. *priestar* > *presbyter*. So in a perfectly regular way we get *Krieger*. This form is found in MHG. In the Middle German dialects the *ie* became *i* and we have the form *Kriger*, which was borrowed by the Middle Low German.

Just as from Latin *miles*, *militem* the verb *militāre* and the noun *militia* were formed, so from *Krieger* were made *kriegen* and *Krieg*.

Kluge (*Wörterbuch*, s. v. *Krieg*) and Hildebrand (*Grimms Wörterb.* Vol. v, 2212) believe that 'effort, exertion, struggle' were the original signification, but all of these meanings are easily derived from that of 'war, fight' (Cf. English *strive*).

George Washington University.

EDWARD H. SEHRT.

¹ Cf. what Jespersen, *Language*, p. 307 has to say about this word.

² Cf. the late OHG. *chrég*, *widarkrég* with the lengthened but unbroken vowel; Kluge, s. v. *Krieg*.

IRVING'S VERSION OF BYRON'S *THE ISLES*
OF GREECE

In an unpublished notebook¹ of Washington Irving's, now in the Seligman collection of the New York Public Library, there is to be found in Irving's handwriting a version of Lord Byron's *The Isles of Greece* which contains some curious variations from the text of the Coleridge edition. The notebook is undated, but there is evidence to show that some of the entries were made during Irving's stay in Paris in 1825. Irving's interest in Byron dates, of course, from a much earlier period, but it was accentuated at this time by his friendly intercourse with Medwin.

It is not clear from what source Irving derived his version. In every case the variants are much inferior to the readings of the accepted text. The first stanza reads:²

The Isles of Greece! the Isles of Greece
Where *lovely* Sappho *lived* & sung
Where grew the arts of war & peace
Where Delos rose & Phoebus sprung.
Eternal *sunshine* gilds them yet,
But all, except their Sun, is set.

In the final couplet of the seventh stanza there is this extraordinary infelicity:

And must thy *voice* so long divine
Degenerate into hands like mine?

The third and fourth lines of the ninth stanza sacrifice the very obvious rhyme:

Leave battle *by* the Turkish hordes
And shed the blood of Scio's *wine*!

There are also many divergencies of spelling and punctuation.

Washington Square College,
New York University.

E. HERMAN HESPELT.

¹ This is listed in the February (1926) number of the *Bulletin of the N. Y. Public Library*, p. 100, as: *Notebook containing extracts of poetry and prose; hint for a tale or farce; and miscellany.* 77 l. 16° Calif. In pencil and ink.

² All italics are mine.

A NOTE ON RENE BOYLESVE'S *LA BECQUÉE*.

A rather striking parallel in the delineation of two of the secondary characters in René Boylesve's *la Becquée* (1901) and Daudet's *Sapho* (1884) would seem to suggest the thought that the creator of Tartarin may have played some part in the development of Boylesve. The parallel occurs in the characters of Césaire Gaussin d'Armandy, called le Fénat, the uncle of the hero of *Sapho*, and of Casimir Fantin, grandfather of the Riquet of *la Becquée*. Both men typify the irresponsible, irrepressible *vieux beau*, still proud of their careers as *viveurs*. Césaire had been a "libertin, coureur de tripots et de guilledoux villageois," a "vaurien," a "mauvais drôle."¹ When the younger Gaussin was attempting to break off with Sapho, the uncle as an experienced hand at such manoeuvres, lent his assistance. He finally settles down, however, becomes "Président des submersionnistes du Rhône, membre du Comité central d'étude et de vigilance, délégué départemental,"² and pays off all old scores by hitting upon the scheme that was to rescue the vineyards of the Provence from the ravages of the *phylloxéra*. The career of grand-père Fantin is very similar to that of the Fénat, except that he remains incorrigible to the end. In addition to his weakness for professional ladies, Casimir was filled with the delusion that he was a shrewd schemer, and embarked upon several disastrous ventures. The crowning assininity in his career of failures was the purchase, on notes, of a piece of land adjoining the estate of his sister-in-law, and the plan to irrigate its hitherto unproductive soil. Especially at this point is the rôle he plays reminiscent of le Fénat. In order to achieve the submersion of the tainted vines, the latter purchases a "machine élévatoire" which is shipped from Paris to the Provence; likewise, for the development of his "moulin de Gruteau," Casimir buys a "machine élévatoire" which immediately becomes the principal topic of gossip in the countryside. The use of this detail in both novels may, of course, be a mere coincidence; but when it is coupled with the general similarity

¹ Vide *Sapho* (Paris, Flammarion, n. d., p. 107).

² Ibid., p. 280.

of the characters of Casimir and le Fénat, the conclusion would seem almost inescapable that Boylesve, in his depiction of the old rake, had, at least unconsciously, been influenced by his recollections of Daudet's *Sapho*.

AARON SCHAFFER.

The University of Texas.

NIETZSCHE THE ROMANTICIST

In Ludwig Stein's *Evolution and Optimism* (1926) I came, on page 144, upon the following astonishing statement: "Nietzsche, as Tieck jeeringly said, was a romanticist." Of Nietzsche it has indeed been remarked that he was a romanticist without being aware of it, but most assuredly the well-known dictum was not jeeringly made by the romanticist Ludwig Tieck. Although Nietzsche was admittedly precocious, his mental development was not quite so amazing as Stein's statement would imply, for when Tieck died, in 1853, the future glorifier of the superman was but a boy of nine. That the famous German philosopher should be credited with such unprecedented precocity by one who is avowedly his "pronounced opponent" is not without its touch of unintended humor.

I might add here that I am acquainted with Karl Joël's volume *Nietzsche und die Romantik* in which he traces the romantic elements in Nietzsche's works.

C. H. IBERSHOFF.

University of Iowa.

THE HEAVEN OF VIRGINS

Sister Madeleva, in her recent book on *The Pearl*,¹ attempts to show that any elegiac interpretation of that much discussed poem is unsound. To this end she argues that no child of two years could be, as the Maiden of the poet's vision declares herself, one of the hundred and forty-four thousand virgins following the Lamb in Paradise, in the procession borrowed from St. John's

¹ *Pearl: A Study in Spiritual Dryness*, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1925.

Apocalypse (14. 1-5). Sister Madeleva very properly notes Professor Schofield's ambiguous use of the term "virgin" in this connection;² she says, "A virgin, always in Catholic theology and certainly at the time that *Pearl* was written, meant a person bound by the vow of chastity or living in that state, without reference to sex."³ This is a point well emphasized. Indeed, the Apostle John's hundred and forty-four thousand virgins are men. Professor Osgood notes, "The 144,000 are thus described in Rev. 14. 4: *Hi sunt, qui cum mulieribus non sunt coinquinati, virgines enim sunt*. But it is more in harmony with the poet's artistic purpose to represent them as maidens."⁴ Wherein Professor Osgood seems also to believe that all the "virgins" in *The Pearl* are women.⁵ In any case, he might have added that our poet was not the first to admit women to the procession; significant for comparison are passages in the alliterative homily *Hali Meidenhad*,⁶ which, by the way, Sister Madeleva probably did not intend to identify with the poem "Of Clene Meidenhad."⁷

² W. H. Schofield, "Symbolism, Allegory, and Autobiography in *The Pearl*," *PMLA*, xxiv (1909), 627.

³ *Pearl: A Study*, p. 12.

⁴ C. G. Osgood (ed.), *The Pearl* (Boston, 1906), p. 85, note to line 785.

⁵ Professor J. B. Fletcher expresses a similar opinion. He writes in "The Allegory of *The Pearl*," *JEGP*, xx (1921), 20, note 107; "That the babe was a girl might be argued from ll. 447-448:

'Alle þat may þerinne aryve
Of alle þe reme is quen oþer kyng.'

The procession later described (sts. xcii-xciii) is altogether of *maidens* exactly like the heroine, 'þe Lambes vyuez.' (l. 785.) This discrepancy is not explained." Just why Professor Fletcher concludes, from the lines he quotes, "that the babe was a girl," I am unable to guess; but the "discrepancy" is easily disposed of by Sister Madeleva's explanation of the term "virgin," and of the regular conception of Christ the Lamb as bridegroom of the pure soul (v. *Pearl: A Study*, pp. 152-154).

⁶ F. J. Furnivall (ed.), *EETS*, xviii (1922), 31 (Titus ms. ll. 311 ff.): "ne moten nane bute heo hoppen ne singen, for þat is ai hare song, þonken godd, ȝ herien, þat he on ham se mucche grace ȝef of him seluen, þat ha forsoken for him euch eorðlich mon . . . ; ȝ i stude of mon of lam, token lives lauerd, þe king of þe hehe blisse." V. also p. 25 (ll. 255-263), and p. 31 (ll. 319-330); cf. "Sawles Warde," in *Old English Homilies*, *EETS*, xxxiv (1868), 261; etc.

⁷ There seems to be some confusion of the two works in connection with

But to return to the assertion that children have no place in the band of virgins: I think the matter will bear consideration. Sister Madeleva writes:

The Vision describes the heaven of virgins The most conveniently adjustable interpretation will not claim for a two-year-old child, no matter in what maturity of glorified beatitude, a state of happiness dependent on deliberate choice, postulating deliberate renunciation. No heaven, even of research, could be more ironical. . . . [Boccaccio's] Olympia recognizes and mentions the distinction between the virgin souls and those of children in heaven. The Maiden does not mention children in her heaven at all, but devotes all her details of description to the company of virgins. If she had been a child she could not have done this consistently.*

But is there not evidence that, at the time when *The Pearl* was written, virginity might be upheld as a virtue even in a child? We recall the beloved story related by Chaucer's Prioress. There the seven-year-old clergeon is praised as "gemme of chastity," and apostrophized in no uncertain terms:

"O martir, souded to virginitee,
Now maystou singen, folwing ever in oon
The whyte lamb celestial," quod she,
"Of which the grete evangelist, seint Iohn,
In Pathmos wroot, which seith that they that goon
Biforn this lamb, and singe a song al newe,
That never, fleshly, wommen they ne knewe." °

Here, then, we have a small child definitely associated with the hundred and forty-four thousand. Chaucer calls the little boy's mother "this newe Rachel,"¹⁰ alluding of course to *Matthew* 2. 18: *Vox in Rama audita est ploratus, et ululatus multus: Rachel plorans filios suos, et noluit consolari, quia non sunt*. This verse is the conclusion of the Gospel read in the Mass on the Feast of the Holy Innocents (December 28); and the Epistle of that Feast is the very passage in which John describes the procession of the virgins. This is the only liturgical use of that particular passage

Sister Madeleva's quotation from Professor Gollancz's 1921 edition of *The Pearl*, in *Pearl: A Study*, p. 86.

* *Pearl: A Study*, pp. 178-179; cf. pp. 152-153.

° *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (ed. Skeat), iv (1894), 185, B. 1769-1775.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 186, B. 1817.

from the *Apocalypse* (as far as I am aware), and the association of the Holy Innocents with the procession must have been familiar enough in the Middle Ages, being brought home to the laity by the medium of homilies and sermons.¹¹ Chaucer naturally finds a place in the procession appropriate to his little hero, who, like the Holy Innocents, was martyred at a tender age.¹²

It seems impossible, then, that the *Pearl*-poet should not have had in mind this association of the procession and the Holy Innocents, especially if, as Sister Madeleva believes, he were a religious. Of course there is no question of martyrdom for the *Pearl*-child (granting a child for the sake of argument); neither need there be, I think, any discussion of doctrines of virginity. The fact that the liturgy describes such small children, *a bimatu et infra* (*Matthew* 2. 16), as forming part of the procession, the *centum quadraginta quatuor millia*,—this fact would seem amply to explain the poet's assigning a place therein to a little girl who "lyfed not two ȝer in oure þede."¹³ Hence, though I have no quarrel with Sister Madeleva's main thesis, I think it cannot be supported by this particular argument.

ELIZABETH HART.

Radcliffe College.

¹¹ The association appears, for example, in Ælfric's sermon *in die Natale Innocentium Infantium*, which is found in *The Homilies of Ælfric*, I (ed. B. Thorpe, London, 1843), 88-90; and in Orm's lines on the same season, *Ormulum*, I (ed. R. M. White, R. Holt, Oxford, 1878), 285, ll. 8213 ff.); cf. also *Cursor Mundi* (ed. R. Morris), *EETS*, LIX (1875), 664, Cott. MS., ll. 11579-80. Of course the possibility is not precluded that Chaucer drew his idea direct, and that we have here, in Professor Young's phrase, "an additional indication of Chaucer's accurate acquaintance with the liturgy of the Church of Rome" ("Chaucer and the Liturgy," *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxx [1915], 99).

¹² Thomas of Monmouth, in his twelfth-century life of St. William of Norwich, Lib. II, cap. II (*The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich*, ed. A. Jessopp and M. James, Cambridge, 1896, p. 64), would place the twelve-year-old martyr among those who follow the Lamb, *Quibus solis ea privilegii concessa est prerogativa, quod soli illius excellentissime novitatis concinunt canticum, quoniam puram et illibatam uirginitatis sue conservantes stolam domino purum munditie sue optulerunt celibatum. Quorum sacris gloriosum martyrem Willelmum reuera non diffidimus interesse collegiis, etc.*

¹³ *The Pearl*, l. 483.

REVIEWS.

The Writings and Life of George Meredith. A Centenary Study.
By MARY STURGE GRETTON. Harvard University Press (Oxford University Press), 1926.

It is unfortunate for Mrs. Gretton that J. B. Priestley's *George Meredith* should have appeared simultaneously with her study or a little earlier in the same year, and should be such a vivid reminder that there is no particular occasion for such a book as hers. There is plenty of occasion for studies of George Meredith, who is the most questionable shape among all the major figures of the later nineteenth century in England. He is certainly a forceful and impressive literary phenomenon, a thinker and a phrase-maker, and an inventor of imaginary human beings, high above the common run for verve and originality. In thought and undertaking he was ahead of his time; his native endowments were so great that one is inclined to call him a genius. But as to the degree of his success in turning his talents to account in the specific arts of poet and novelist, there has never been a time when the critical mind was so much in doubt, when there has been so great a call for a truly critical mind for making judicious appraisal. The critic of Meredith must be capable of detachment; he must be acquainted with the poetic art and particularly with the art of the novel as practised in other times and lands; he must have some notion of the course of novelistic development since Meredith; he must be possessed of perspective. In other words the critic must not be a mere devotee of the Meredith cult, nor immersed over head and ears in the thought and sentiment of this particular specimen of late-Victorian humanity. Such a critic Mr. Priestley may, with slight reservations, be pronounced to be. The most that can be said of Mrs. Gretton is that she brings together again, as it has been done more than once, with good taste and discretion of the negative sort, a few facts about Meredith's life, some comment on some of the poems, a detailed account of the plots of the novels and of *Modern Love*, an acknowledgment, here and there, that there are faults in his style or in the conception of a novel, and here and there a good deal of enthusiastic comment on this and that character or this and that situation in one of the stories.

Now the facts of Meredith's life have been set forth in sufficient detail, in *George Meredith: his Life and Friends in Relation to his Work* (1920), by Meredith's second cousin, Mr. S. M. Ellis. What one would wish for in such a centenary volume as Mrs.

Gretton's is an interpretation of the character of George Meredith, or such a presentation of the facts as would bring out in vivid relief the striking colors of his personality,—including the self-consciousness, the intellectual and social pride, the morbid sensitiveness, and even in one domestic instance the cruelty, as well as the generosity of spirit, the tenderness, the conscientiousness, the courage, and the intellectual honesty of the man. All this is done by Mr. Priestley; whereas Mrs. Gretton goes on speaking of Meredith in the awed voice of one of his cult, as if he were still there in his wheel-chair, in his honored and pathetic old age, to overhear what was being said of him.

One thing which should be included in any general book on Meredith is an account of his philosophy of nature and man. This, which has perhaps attracted more readers to Meredith than anything else in him, and may turn out to be his chief claim to distinction has been fully and intelligently set forth by G. M. Trevelyan in his *Poetry and Philosophy of George Meredith* (1906). But Meredith's philosophy is capable of briefer statement, and it certainly needs to be considered critically in reference to the thought of his time and of our time. Mr. Priestley has made the briefer statement and has in considerable measure given the critical consideration. Mrs. Gretton has done neither. In this, as in all other matters of critical importance, she seems not to have advanced beyond the position from which she wrote her earlier volume, *George Meredith: Novelist, Poet, Reformer* (1906). Her criticism of Meredith's poetry is largely devoted to an illustration of his unusual fidelity to nature or his power in the use of metaphor, and it is only in the middle of a paragraph that she makes a passing reference to what, if it is true, is the most important of all considerations in judging the poetry of Meredith. "Always, when faced with a choice," she says, Meredith "has let go the emotional unity rather than sacrifice the fidelity of his observation. That, of course, is the reason why, though he is always highly poetic, he only sometimes in his verse-writing achieves poetry."

It is in a view of the novels that Mrs. Gretton's method of peddling detail is most disappointing of all. And here again the contrast with Mr. Priestley forces itself on our attention. Mrs. Gretton faithfully mulls over each work of fiction in the order of its appearance and finds something to say of it individually as if it existed alone in the world; as if novels had never been written by Trollope and Flaubert, by Tolstoi and Jane Austen; as if there were no such problem as that of a better or a worse in the method of telling a story, of presenting lifelike human beings in an action that may give an aspect of life. She seems unaware that she is dealing with that English novelist who, considering his power and richness, is the most irritating of all novelists by virtue of his

obstinate turning of his back on all the approved means of arousing our interest in his characters or even our faith in their existence. She brings no such generalizing critical energy as Mr. Priestley to the definition of Meredith's comic method and to the description of that strange blend and conflict in him of comedy with lyrical-fantastic romance. Neither of these critics seems to me to make sufficiently emphatic the damage that is done to Meredith's work by his obstinate insistence on being the moralistic showman, his want of that modest patience in the presence of facts and of faith in the power of facts to speak for themselves, which we find in the followers of the school of objective realism. But Mr. Priestley has come nearer than any other critic to realizing this tragic fault in Meredith. And so he is in a position to do, what Mrs. Gretton cannot do, inquire into those innovations in psychological method which, in spite of all his faults, give Meredith that startling air of modernity and make him a figure in the development of the novel of an importance infinitely greater than would be indicated by his actual success in any of his fictions unless it be *The Egoist*. Mrs. Gretton has a great deal of fault to find with Meredith's failure to convince in the critical scenes in *Diana* (having to do with her sale of the state secret confided to her by her lover). What she does not see is that this is the most interesting thing undertaken by Meredith in the whole book—one of the most interesting psychological situations ever undertaken by a novelist—and that it is undertakings like this, even when he makes a failure of them, that give Meredith his claim to high distinction as a novelist.

It is clear that criticism is only just beginning to grapple in any serious way with the problems presented by Meredith's art. The real beginning is to be found in Mr. Priestley's book. Mrs. Gretton's is a perfectly respectable review of the conception of Meredith held by his special devotees in the nineteenth century.

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH.

University of Minnesota.

The Background of Modern French Literature. By C. H. C. WRIGHT. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1926. Pp. xiv + 329.

L'auteur de ce livre s'est proposé avant tout de fournir aux étudiants américains des renseignements suffisants sur les "political, religious, and social conditions" pour leur permettre de mieux comprendre la littérature du dix-neuvième siècle. Son ouvrage est donc destiné à apporter un supplément d'information aux histoires

de la littérature qui négligent forcément l'étude de la société pour étudier les hommes et les œuvres. Il suffit de l'ouvrir pour se rendre compte que, sous un volume restreint, il représente une somme considérable de travail, de longues recherches et une documentation patiente et minutieuse. Des illustrations nombreuses, bien présentées et en général bien choisies ajoutent à la valeur de ce travail qui est appelé à rendre des services évidents aux élèves et aux maîtres. Ceci dit, il me sera permis de présenter quelques réserves. La première porte sur le titre même du volume. Le mot "background" est si compréhensif et si général que l'on est tout d'abord tenté de chercher dans le livre de M. Wright bien des choses que, volontairement sans doute, il a cru devoir omettre. C'est ainsi que l'on n'y trouvera aucune indication sur le mouvement scientifique. Il n'est cependant pas inutile de savoir quelque chose de Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire pour lire la préface de la *Comédie humaine* ou quelque chose de l'*Introduction à la médecine expérimentale* pour comprendre et juger les étranges prétentions de Zola à la science. Les travaux de M. Citoleux sur *La poésie philosophique en France* et de M. Fusil sur *La poésie scientifique* auraient fourni sur ce point et sur quelques autres bien des indications dont l'auteur aurait pu faire son profit. Après un chapitre excellent dans lequel les régions françaises sont étudiées et définies avec justesse (*The land of France*) vient un chapitre beaucoup moins satisfaisant: *Thought and policy under the Revolution and Empire*. M. Wright y mentionne le Concordat en passant, mais n'indique même pas qu'il y eut en France à ce moment un renouveau de religion ou de religiosité; il ne nomme les Idéologues que pour dire que Napoléon les détestait et passe complètement sous silence Madame de Staël, Chateaubriand, Bonald et Joseph de Maistre. Il est regrettable que l'auteur qui cite à plusieurs reprises le livre assez médiocre de Charles Adam, *La philosophie en France (première moitié du dix-neuvième siècle)*, n'ait probablement pas pu consulter à temps le livre plus récent et mieux informé de George Boas, *French philosophers of the Romantic period*. Pour s'en tenir à des ouvrages publiés en France, il aurait été utile de se reporter au moins aux *Politiques et moralistes* de Faguet qui ne sont même pas indiqués dans la bibliographie.

Les parties de chapitre ou les paragraphes consacrés aux arts paraîtront à quelques-uns bien incomplets. Je crois que tout le monde ne suivra pas M. Wright quand il affirme que "the attempts of Rude to represent motion in stone are sometimes more grotesque than inspiring as in his famous figures on the Arc de Triomphe. The sculptor David d'Angers was more restrained" (p. 172). Pour ma part, c'est plutôt à certaines statues de David d'Angers que j'oserais appliquer le qualificatif de "grotesque"; mais c'est une affaire de goût. On regrettera que, parmi les mo-

dernes, M. Wright ne cite ni Rodin, ni Bourdelle ni Bartholomée, pour ne parler que des plus grands. Le seul peintre récent à qui l'auteur accorde une mention de quelque longueur est le douanier Rousseau dont la gloire éphémère est due à une farce de rapins. Manet et Monet sont cités mais non caractérisés; Carrière et Gustave Moreau qui pourtant touchent de près à la littérature sont passés sous silence. Ils méritent en tout cas plus que Puvis de Chavanne l'épithète de "symbolistes" qui est appliquée à ce dernier. Je renverrai le lecteur curieux de plus de détails aux pages que M. Wright consacre au nu dans les arts (p. 298). Ce sujet est probablement trop scabreux pour être discuté ici. Pour la musique les omissions me paraissent également sérieuses. On trouvera un traitement assez détaillé de l'opérette, de l'opéra bouffe, des cafés chantants (pp. 210-211) et même des cabarets (p. 303); mais M. Wright ne cite ni les Concerts Colonne, ni les Concerts Lamoureux; il mentionne Offenbach mais non Bizet, non plus que Debussy. Il cite André Messager mais ne parle pas des opéras de Saint Saëns et, en tout cas, il aurait valu la peine d'indiquer les controverses soulevées par la production des opéras de Wagner. Ces réserves faites et elles ne sont pas sans importance, on trouvera d'excellents chapitres sur *la littérature et les mœurs* au dix-neuvième siècle et c'est bien là le titre qu'à mon avis le livre tout entier devrait porter. L'auteur a réussi à démêler les différents courants politiques du dix-neuvième siècle et il en a présenté un tableau sommaire et intelligible sinon complet, ce n'est pas là un mince mérite. Il a indiqué les transformations qui se sont opérées au cours du siècle dans la société française. En attirant l'attention sur les excentricités et les perversions du goût il a peut-être en quelques endroits déformé la réalité et trop insisté sur l'aspect caricatural des choses. Mais, au total, il s'est efforcé de rapprocher la littérature de la vie et, par là même, son livre fournira une documentation utile à ceux de nos étudiants qui lisent les auteurs français du dix-neuvième siècle, sans avoir toujours le temps ou les indications nécessaires pour aller chercher dans de nombreux volumes les renseignements que M. Wright a réunis ici sous une forme compacte et commode.

GILBERT CHINARD.

Studies in the Narrative Method of Defoe. By ARTHUR WELLESLEY SECORD. The University of Illinois Press, 1924. 248 pp.

The study of Defoe's works is a veritable wandering wood of error. Such elementary biographical facts as the year of his birth and the number of times he was married have been established

only in relatively recent years. We are by no means certain of what he really wrote. This doubt as to authorship does not concern merely miscellaneous and controversial papers but extends even to considerable and important works, such as the *Memoirs of a Cavalier*. It is reasonable to think that an intensive study of disputed pieces would, in most cases, settle the question; and such an extended study is indeed needed. Mr. Secord in the present volume effectually lays at least one such ghost—at last bringing the much-disputed *Memoirs of Captain Carleton* safely into the fold. The long antecedent controversy, however, remains of more than curious interest, for it affords another striking illustration of Defoe's genius for deception. Not only were the memoirs taken by Dr. Johnson, Scott and other literary folk to be genuine memoirs of Captain George Carleton; historians and military gentlemen have drawn upon them as one of the "documents" of the period! And when Mr. Secord demonstrates how airily, not to say jauntily, they are based upon the real career of George Carleton, as it has been painstakingly recovered, our admiration for Defoe glows afresh.

In the course of Mr. Secord's demonstration, his most original contribution is the discovery of printed sources for much that is authentic enough but purely fictitious as applied to Captain Carleton. In fact, throughout the volume, Mr. Secord's unflagging concern is with Defoe's sources. And it may be said that in his careful investigation of little known material, including maps, he has gone beyond any of his predecessors; and to good purpose.

Nearly half the volume is judiciously devoted to *Robinson Crusoe*. It must be confessed that here many of his tentative results are less than acceptable. A good case is made out for Defoe's use of Robert Knox's printed account of his life as a castaway for nineteen years on Ceylon; but the idea that Defoe might have met Knox personally and so have gathered additional details either orally or from a glance at certain manuscript notes—a suggestion given currency by Mr. Masfield following Mr. James Ryan—remains, after all that Mr. Secord can do for it, scarcely more than an assumption. One of Mr. Secord's arguments for this position is that Knox's manuscript notes trail off into moralizings upon his experiences, just as Crusoe's narrative dwindles to the "Serious Reflections" of Part III. Surely such an argument is more controversial than critical, in view of Defoe's obvious independent interest in just this strain of writing. Mr. Secord also works hard with the footprints, but comes off badly. Yet in the main his tracing of sources is undoubtedly an extensive and solid contribution to our knowledge of Defoe. The clear-cut examples of Defoe's dependence on Dampier's *Voyages* for the sail from Bengal to Tonquil Bay and the incident of the careened ship attacked by

savages in the *Farther Adventures*, are worth much; and we readily accept the innumerable other indebtednesses pointed out. Similarly, the demonstration that Defoe lifted virtually the whole outline of Crusoe's journey from Peking to Archangel from Ides's *Three Years Travel from Moscow overland to China*, merely reversing the direction, must remain a permanently salient fact which no future writer on Defoe is likely to neglect.

One of the author's happiest conclusions (pp. 162, 233) from his investigations is that in starting *Robinson Crusoe* Defoe did not foresee the possibilities of the island story, but that on reaching the incident it grew upon his hands into the great thing it is. Implicit in this reflection is a tribute to its essential originality. And here it is interesting to note (what the author does not sufficiently bring out) that, despite the tracing of individual details in the island story to this or that suggestion in Dampier, Selkirk, Knox and others, no single, satisfying model for this, the most famous thing in Defoe, is forthcoming. The island story, for all the fine scrutiny it has earned, retains a degree of independence and originality not shared by the *Farther Adventures* and many of the other narratives, where Defoe may be seen leaning heavily on this or that single work. The same is true of the best thing in *Singleton*, the journey across Africa—again, thinks Mr. Secord, an exploitation not originally included in Defoe's scheme. These are indeed suggestive reflections.

In general, however, Mr. Secord's conclusions are less satisfying than the preliminary investigations. The short final chapter on Defoe's methods is hardly more than a summarized statement of the facts previously presented, with little real analysis. Some of the conclusions offered are highly questionable. In a paragraph of just two sentences on Defoe's characterization (p. 238), we read of his skill in this respect that "in addition to a group of lesser men (and women), it produced, in Robinson Crusoe, one of the great personages of fiction." To ascribe the greatness of the book to the characterization of the hero, in any appreciable degree, as Mr. Secord seems to do here, and plainly does elsewhere, is surely ill-judged; while to place Crusoe above Colonel Jaque or Moll Flanders in point of characterization is too serenely unorthodox to pass unnoticed. Mr. Secord's apparent failure to relish the telling yet subtle character of "St. Mary of Flanders" perhaps accounts for his too easy dismissal of the picaresque influence on Defoe. That the historian of Moll Flanders, with her helter-skelter adventures, Colonel Jaque, Captain Singleton, Jonathan Wild, *et al.*, is virtually uninfected by the rogue virus, as Mr. Secord and others believe, is not yet obvious.

Appreciation of the essential colorfulness of the materials offered in this volume is hampered by the presentation. Mr.

Secord seldom writes with precision and never with distinction. Moreover, the orthography and proofreading are exceptionally bad. The author does not adhere consistently to the use of quotation marks to distinguish titles. The complete eschewment of square brackets for enclosing explanatory remarks of his own in the midst of quotations is not only a violation of good usage but sometimes confusing. Misprints are altogether too frequent—as “port” for part (p. 27), “partisans” for partisan (p. 31), “unware” for unaware (p. 88), “more” for mere (p. 168), “Swife” for Swift (p. 207), etc. It would be ungracious to dwell further upon trifles which cannot in the least detract from the permanent usefulness of his work; but such matters are nevertheless no credit either to Mr. Secord or to the school under whose auspices the volume was issued.

HOWARD BUCK.

Yale University.

La Pensée française au dix-huitième siècle. Par DANIEL MORNET.
Paris: Armand Colin, 1926. Pp. 220.

La série de petits volumes sur l'histoire littéraire déjà publiés dans la “*Collection Armand Colin*,” bien qu'écrits pour le grand public, méritent de retenir l'attention des spécialistes. Ils ont été confiés à des chercheurs qui ont été forcés de condenser dans un cadre limité le résultat de longs travaux, les conclusions générales qu'ils avaient atteintes après des enquêtes détaillées conduites avec patience et diligence. Tel est le cas du *Naturalisme français* et de *Parnasse et symbolisme* de Pierre Martino, de *L'Ecole classique française (1660-1715)* de A. Bailly, du *Félibrige* d'Emile Ripert et de *La Renaissance des lettres en France, de Louis XII à Henri IV* de Jean Plattard. Tel est enfin le cas de l'étude que M. Mornet vient de faire paraître dans la même collection. On y trouvera tout autre chose qu'un tableau sommaire des lettres françaises au dix-huitième siècle et des chapitres plus ou moins détaillés sur les chefs de file. M. Mornet s'est appliqué, au contraire, à reconstituer dans toute leur complexité et leur enchevêtrement les principaux courants de pensée qui traversent tout le siècle. Il a été ainsi amené à faire et à présenter la synthèse des nombreux travaux sur le dix-huitième qu'il a publiés depuis plus de vingt ans. Il a donc apporté un correctif indispensable à l'excès de simplification des histoires littéraires qui pourrait faire croire aux débutants qu'ils connaissent le siècle pour avoir étudié quelques écrivains isolés. Je ne vois guère dans l'ensemble qu'une correction ou plutôt une addition à apporter à la synthèse de M. Mornet. Il m'apparaît de plus en plus probable que les origines

de l'esprit du dix-huitième siècle doivent être recherchées non pas seulement chez certains écrivains dont les œuvres paraissent dans le dernier quart du dix-septième siècle, mais peut-être au moins autant chez les politiques et les moralistes de la fin du seizième. On doit d'ailleurs reconnaître que ces courants restent souterrains pendant la plus grande partie du dix-septième siècle et n'affleurent à la surface qu'aux environs de 1680. Il n'en reste pas moins que pour trouver leur "source" originelle il faut remonter bien plus haut et que leur continuité n'a pas été interrompue.

GILBERT CHINARD.

A Czech Phonetic Reader. By ANTONÍN FRINTA, Ph. D., Lecturer in the University of Prague. (*The London Phonetic Readers series.*) London: The University of London Press, 17 Warwick Square, E. C. 4, 1925. Price, 5 shillings net.

Doctor Frinta succeeds admirably in accomplishing one object of his little book, which is, as the introduction says, "to record, as accurately as possible, one form of Czech pronunciation," by employing symbols of the International Phonetic Alphabet to represent the thirty essential phonemes peculiar to spoken Czech and, in addition, five separate symbols for subsidiaries of certain principal phonemes. A brief, but clear and accurate, discussion of Czech sounds covers intelligently several details that ordinarily escape the notice of writers at greater length on the subject of the Bohemian language.

The author expresses the hope that the book "will prove helpful to English readers who would like to acquaint themselves with the Czech language, literature, culture and spirit." To this end, the selections forming the body of the Reader include conversational matter, popular proverbs, the Protestant version of the Lord's Prayer, and excerpts from the writings of Jan Hus and Komenský, as well as celebrated modern authors like Božena Němcová, Karolína Světlá and Alois Jirásek. The poets are represented by quotations from Svatopluk Cech, Jaroslav Vrchlický, Antonín Sova and others equally famous.

Inasmuch as most English speaking people do not understand Czech and are unfamiliar with it as it appears in print, it might have added to the helpfulness, as well as to the convenience, of the present work to have given interlinearly a version of each selection in Czech characters and also an English translation along with the phonetic text and thus dispensed with the vocabulary which occupies more than half the book. As it is, the reader must be con-

stantly referring to a list of words, printed in the phonetic symbols, followed by the Czech transliteration and the English meaning. In many instances only that case of a noun or adjective or the particular inflection of a verb as it is to be found in the text is listed, rather than the nominative case or the infinitive usually given in the dictionaries. A few slight inaccuracies occur: *e. g.*, an imperfective *blížíti se* is translated "to approach," whereas the exact meaning is "to be approaching"; but both text and vocabulary are singularly free from the misprints that generally abound in the productions of printers having occasion to use a strange alphabet.

J. B. DUDEK.

Yukon, Oklahoma.

The Beginnings of English Literary Periodicals. By WALTER GRAHAM, Ph. D. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1926. iv, 92 pp.

Professor Graham presents here a descriptive rather than an historical study of English periodical literature from 1665 to 1715. His four chapters deal successively with the learned periodical, the periodical of amusement, some critics and reformers, and the *Tatler*, *Spectator*, and *Guardian*. The book, though by no means final, is a valuable and compact account, naturally more illuminating for the less known journals than for the *Tatler* group. The five illustrations, reproductions of title pages of rare periodicals, form a grateful addition.

In so summary a treatment, much has had to be omitted. Among titles which could show an equal claim with some admitted are the *Occasional Paper*, the *Rehearsal*, the *Memoirs of Literature*, the *Mercurius Reformatus*, and John Houghton's *Letters*. Nor does Mr. Graham say anything about the influence of the booksellers on the editors of the literary journals, the use of these journals as advertising organs for certain publishers and authors, and the growth of a style suitable for this new form of literature. The economy in footnotes has not always permitted the author to give full references, or to acknowledge indebtedness to other investigators.

ROGER P. MCCUTCHEON.

Tulane University.

Berthe au Grand Pied, d'après deux romans en vers du XIII^e siècle. By LOUIS BRANDIN. Illustrations by A. SERVANT. Paris: Boivin, 1924. xi + 150 pp.

M. Brandin's purpose seems to be merely to give the story to the public in a comprehensible and instructive form, to popularize it rather than to restore it. The preface tells us that this version, which is in modern French prose, was based upon the *Berthe au grand pied* of Adenet le Roi and a Franco-Italian *Berta de li gran pie*. Adenet's version, written about 1275, is the work of a conscious and adequate artist. M. B. does not follow his sources slavishly; he handles his plot far better than either of them. He has selected interesting episodes from each, and, with his vast knowledge and not inconsiderable artistry, has constructed a coherent story. If he does not find enough setting and motivation in the sources, he supplies it. He even goes so far as to attribute psycho-analyzable dreams to the king! Thus the book is hardly a translation.

There are striking contrasts between the sources and the modernization. Adenet begins his prolog by saying that he was in Paris on a Friday in April, and, because it was Friday, he decided to go to St. Denis to pray. While there he became acquainted with an agreeable monk who showed him a book of history in which he read the story of Pépin, etc. "Poetasters," he said, "have falsified the history; never have I seen the like!" So he stayed on until Tuesday and carried off the real story. Then he guarantees that the stupid people will be bored and that the intelligent will be delighted with the way he has retold it. On the other hand, M. B. writes the prolog in a neo-archaic style, omitting his reason for going to St. Denis, calling the *moine courtois a saint homme*, the *livre as estoires* some *vieux parchemins*, having the monk *l'octroyer de le copier* instead of simply *monstrer*, and omitting the delightful "blurb" at the end. Words such as *relatant*, *relating*, a word which is now archaic but which is relatively new and learned, and *dolentes aventures* are, I think, inartistic. When a word like *dolente*, which Adenet uses on nearly every page with verbal force, is used as a weak, preceding adjective, it excites a feeling of pity similar to that which one feels on seeing a lion forced to jump through a hoop.

M. B.'s version of the story is introduced by a famous minstrel who sings seven quatrains in regard to Berthe, replete with lines such as "Il n'est cour que la cour de Pépin," or "Loin n'en faut-il rechercher la raison," which evoke the XVth century rather than the XIIIth. After an obvious list of gifts to the minstrel, we read that Pépin sends twelve noble vassals with customary impedimenta to the king of Hongrie to ask for his daughter. Then,

regretting that she has not feet of the same size, Pépin falls asleep and dreams that he sees many beauties, some with small feet, some with middle sized feet, some with large feet and some with feet fantastically unequal! Now Adenet covers that ground in fourteen lines. He has already used a hundred lines leading up to the events of the story by telling of Pépin's earlier life, his slaying of the lion single handed, his childless first marriage, etc. Thus, in the Adenet version, when Engerrans de Montcler says simply, in four lines, that he has heard Berthe well spoken of, Pépin sends without further discussion to ask her hand in marriage. These illustrations will suffice to point out some obvious differences between a Mediaeval work, which is inclined to take on the shape of a chronicle, and the modern version, which is presumably more conscious, studied story telling.

And yet the story, as told by M. B., is not an example of impeccable narrative art. It seems to me that it would be better without the incident of the ambassadors introducing tables at the court of Floire and Blanchefleur, the irritating and obvious mention that as Berthe sat spinning she had just finished singing a *chanson de toile*, or the epilog which M. B. affixes to the story. In the scene where Blanchefleur arrives in Paris, M. B. describes her as looking down upon the city and neighboring sites under the guidance of Pépin, who has all the air of a business man on the way out to the country club; but Adenet, *Laisse LXXXI*, does not mention the king and makes a grand scene of the musings of the magnificent queen before whose eyes every man trembled. Again, M. B. suppresses the premonition of Blanchefleur that Aliste is not her daughter; he actually has her feel of Aliste's foot before she finds it out. There are additional cases in which M. B. eliminates the typical, superstitious attitude of the people. Of course a modern version must be made to cohere, but it loses some of the *élan* when such elemental details are omitted.

Two passages (pp. 105 and 149), which the author takes from *Berta de li gran pie*, were obviously in the source merely to motivate something which was to happen in another epic and really have no very cogent *raison d'être* in this version. Although it would have been interesting to include the animated conversations (from *Berta de li gran pie*) between Floire and Blanchefleur before and after her trip to Paris, M. B. is wise in not using them; it is evident that the author of the *Berta* invented this and other comedy bits to amuse the pit, for Blanchefleur is much too dignified to say anything of the kind. It was unwise, I think, to change the final meeting of mother and daughter after the various vicissitudes of their separation; the stage is set (p. 137), and Berthe has just finished a piece of embroidery when the royal

pair arrive. According to M. B. Berthe faints, not her mother, as in Adenet. The effect is far greater when the superb Blanche-fleur sinks to the floor than when the dazed, colorless Berthe, who has acted like an automaton or a saint in a trance throughout the story, faints away.

In general the version of M. B. is highly acceptable. Its principal fault, as I see it, is that it is too instructive, too full of allusions to Mediaeval customs, geography, and literature. At times it gives the impression that a perfectly restored building of the Middle Ages gives: it leaves too little to be desired. It causes no longing. It gives you the expected at every turn. However, there should be a copy of it in every library, for the romance is one of the very most interesting. Moreover, none of the old versions is easy for the modern reader to understand. M. B. has done a fine thing in making this beautiful poem available to the general reader.

JULIAN EARLE HARRIS.

University of Wisconsin.

Antichrist and Adam, two Mediaeval Religious Dramas Translated into English by SARAH F. BARROW, Ph. D., and WILLIAM H. HULME, Ph. D. The Western Reserve University Bulletin, August, 1925. 68 pp.

According to the prefatory statement, Professors Hulme and Barrow have published these translations to supplement Professor Adams' *Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas*, for teachers of undergraduate courses in the history of the drama. Professor Hulme's part of this joint task includes the Prefatory Introduction and the translation of *Antichrist*; Dr. Barrow's, the translation of *Adam*. His approach to these plays in this Introduction necessitates a disproportionate discussion of matters having nothing to do with the translations.

In the beginning he states very pertinently that these plays are of great importance for any study of mediaeval drama. Since the introduction and the translations are primarily for the general rather than the special student of early drama, it might be helpful to suggest something of their importance in relation to the mediaeval drama as a whole: e. g., *Antichrist* is the earliest example of a drama with an apparently propagandistic purpose, with a national or party bias, and of a play which includes allegorical figures; along with the *Daniel of Beauvais* and the *Daniel of Hilarius*, the Benedictbeuern Christmas and Passion plays, *Antichrist* illustrates the high development reached by authors of operatic dramas

of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; and the *Adam* play is the earliest extant mediaeval religious drama written in vernacular and intended to be recited instead of sung. In calling attention to certain dramatic qualities of permanent worth in these plays, Professor Hulme emphasizes the "individualized character portrayal" in them. This is a pleasing and distinctive feature of the *Adam*, but the elements combined in *Antichrist* practically preclude individualized characterization. The actors, with notable exceptions, are personifications—e. g., Synagogue, Justice, Mercy, Hypocrisy, Ecclesia—or pretty generalized figures—King of Teutons, King of Franks, Emperor of Rome, King of Babylon, etc. And the operatic pattern employed serves primarily to accentuate typical rather than individualized character and action. The fact that *Adam* has the freedom of spoken drama explains the author's "greater skill in character-portrayal and in management of crisp, racy dialogue."

Again, the reviewer wonders just what Professor Hulme means by the statement: "It hardly seems possible that the unknown authors of these two dramas were not familiar with Terentian comedy or with some other form of the ancient classical drama." In the first place, there is no reason to doubt that the authors may have been familiar with the comedies of Terence. Numerous manuscripts of his plays were preserved in monasteries. Hrotswitha's use of them about two centuries earlier in a monastery closely connected with Tegernsee, home of *Antichrist*, is a case in point. But, more to the point, just what elements in these plays indicate essentially the influence of Terence or 'some other form of the ancient classical drama'? In further comment he compares them with the "best cyclical Miracle Plays" and the "genuine cyclical Miracle Plays" of England. Now to the casual reader, terminology may appear a mere detail. But surely we shall continue to darken counsel in the whole field of mediaeval drama as long as we persist in applying the term Miracle Plays indiscriminately to English craft cycles of the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries. As the reviewer pointed out some years ago, (1) even contemporary records of popular usage do not justify the sweeping statements of historians of the drama in including all religious plays in this term; and (2) contemporary official records never employ the term miracle play in their references to cyclic plays or to independent religious plays of any kind. ("The Miracle Play in England—Nomenclature," *PMLA.*, xxxi, pp. 448-456.) Furthermore, the Miracle Play in its origin is a distinct type.

Professor Hulme states concisely the facts concerning the remote and immediate source of the *Antichrist* material. The results of a more careful study than has been made of the relation of this

play to contemporary plays and other contemporary literature, of its political, religious, and social background, of the interrelations of cultural centers in eleventh and twelfth century Germany, and of the verse of the play in various relations (see Wilh. Meyer, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Mittellateinischen Rythmik* (1905), "Ludus de Antichristo u. d. Lateinischen Rythmen," pp. 170 ff.) should assist distinctly in an interpretation of the significance and value of the play for the student of mediaeval drama. Such a contribution I hope to make reasonably soon. The fact that this play is connected with the Christmas play of *Carmina Burana* and that its humanistic qualities aroused the ire of Gerhoh von Reichersberg, the zealous monastic reformer of the twelfth century, suggests features of interest and significance not mentioned by Professor Hulme in his introduction.

He summarizes clearly and adequately the material from Studer's introduction to his edition of *Le Mystère d'Adam*, but for the benefit of the reader who desires a comprehensive approach to the problem of the play, he should at least have referred to Professor Craig's and Miss Jenney's articles on the "Origin of the Old Testament Plays" (*Mod. Phil.*, x, pp. 473 ff.; XIII, pp. 59 ff.), and to Professor Young's "Ordo Prophetarum" (*Trans., Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, xx (1922), pp. 1-82.) Studer apparently knew nothing of Craig's and Jenney's studies; and Young's study appeared after Studer's edition of *Adam*. In Professor Hulme's statement that *Adam* belongs to the transitional period "during which liturgical plays gradually changed from their earlier, purely religious form, place in the church liturgy, and purpose to partially or wholly secularized representation of incidents from biblical history, or from the lives of the saints," there persists the misleading analogy of the origin and development of mediaeval drama as a continuous, undifferentiated 'evolutionary' process. The exposition of this fallacy was the basis of an important article which Professor Manly published about twenty years ago ("Literary Forms and the New Theory of the Origin of Species," *Mod. Phil.*, iv, pp. 577 ff.)

In connection with the translation of *Antichrist*, it seems to the reviewer unfortunate that Professor Hulme did not follow the example of Professor Adams, who prints a standard, original text of the liturgical plays parallel with the translation. The text of this play is practically inaccessible to all except a few students of mediaeval drama. He explains that he himself did not have access to the best text (Wilh. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-70) but employed Froning's edition (*Das Drama des Mittelalters* (1892), Erster Teil, S. 206-224.) In form, the translation is a prose rendering, line for line, as is the case with *Adam*. In most respects this translation is clear, adequate, and acceptable. But there is one

grave error. The stage directions to the actors are regularly some form of *Cantare*. These he translates as speak, converse, say, reply, report, address, etc. This causes the reader of the translation to miss entirely the distinctive quality of the play, which is operatic. Its effects result from solo and choral parts, as do those of the remarkable *Daniel of Beauvais*, with which Creizenach compares it. Passages in his translation to be questioned are the italicized lines following (ll. 21-28):

Qui igitur tam multifariis
unum dicunt preesse
illorum contrariis
est affici necesse.

Ne ergo unum subici
contrariis dicamus
et his divinam affici
naturam concedamus.

* * *

Whoever says therefore that one god
Rules over such manifold interests,
Must needs believe that he
Shows his favors to hostile peoples.

Let us not therefore assert that
Unlike people are subject to one god
Whose duties, we observe,
Also differ in their turn.

And "Bring Synogoga and the old chaps to me" seems out of harmony with the general tone of the drama as a translation of the line

Synogogam et senes mihi representate

when Antichrist sends for the prophets.

Professor Barrow's task of translating line for line the eight and ten syllable verse of *Adam* into prose "as literal as (is) consistent with rendition into clear, simple English" was easier than Professor Hulme's for *Antichrist* and gave her greater opportunity. This is the case because, with the exception of the speeches of God and the Prophets, the general pitch is conversational rather than oratorical, and this responds favorably to the rhythm of English prose. A good illustration of this fact is to be found in her translation of the often quoted speech of Diabolus to Eve (ll. 227-234):

Tu es fieblette e tendre chose,
E es plus fresche que n'est rose;
Tu es plus blanche que cristal,
Que neif que chiet sor glace en val;
Mal cuple em fist li criator:
Tu es trop tendre e il trop dur;

Mais neporquant tu es plus sage,
En grant sens as mis tun corrage.

* * *

Thou art a delicate and tender thing,
And thou art fresher than the rose;
Thou art whiter than crystal
Than snow which falls on ice in the valley;
The creator has made a bad match,
Thou art too tender and he too hard
And yet thou are wiser,
Thou hast set thy heart on wisdom.

GEORGE R. COFFMAN.

Boston University.

Elizabethan Playwrights: A Short History of the English Drama from the Beginning to the Closing of the Theaters in 1642, by FELIX E. SCHELLING. xiv + 335 pp. Harper and Brothers. New York and London, 1925.

This volume initiates the *Plays and Playwrights Series*, under the general editorship of Professor Arthur Hobson Quinn, which aims to present in companion volumes the history of the modern drama in its various periods, and typical plays of the periods. It is eminently fitting that the history of the English drama from the beginnings to the closing of the theaters in 1642 should be treated by Professor Schelling who has devoted a rich lifetime to the study of Elizabethan drama in its genius, high development and decline, and who for two decades has stood foremost among the American historians of this drama considered in its entirety. It is a matter for congratulation, indeed, that in the Indian summer of his career this clear-visioned and scrupulous scholar has been given the opportunity to write a concise history of the earlier drama. It brings up to date the earlier work published in 1908 under the title of the *Elizabethan Drama*, and has the added advantage of brevity. Here is a judicial, catholic and conservative history which will meet the needs of scholars and of cultivated readers for many years to come.

"In any work of scholarly cast," says the author in his Preface, "we may decide, as some have decided, to accept nothing whatever that other scholars have done, but to go down to the bedrock of original material and demonstrate once more the justice of the acceptance of the multiplication table. The other extreme gives us a history of former critical opinion expressed with that evasive particularity which leaves things exactly where they were. There is perhaps a third course which, on the basis of a first-hand knowledge of the materials in question and with a diligent endeavor to become acquainted with other superstructures that scholarship has

reared upon them, makes a selective rather than an exhaustive use of these materials, and is less emulous of singularity than of a modest effort to get at and present, as nearly as possible, the truth. This last has been the ideal in this case. It is too much to hope that any ideal can reach more than a qualified fulfillment." This paragraph correctly expresses the course which Professor Schelling has sought to follow, and in the opinion of the reviewer he has so well fulfilled his intention that little qualification is necessary, despite the modest disclaimer in the closing sentence.

The contributions of the church, of humanism and of the court to the drama in its earlier stages, the new drama of passion inaugurated by Marlowe, the vogue of history plays, of comedy, domestic and romantic, and of high tragedy, primarily under the inspiration of Shakespeare, the bias of satire under Jonson, the flourishing of tragicomedy at the hands of Beaumont and Fletcher and their followers, the development of the masque for the diversion of the court, and the decline of the drama through "subtilized sentiment and strained situation" to "amateurish rococo romance and unabashed vulgarity" under the Cavalier dramatists,—such in brief is the history of the Elizabethan drama as Professor Schelling traces it in some eleven chapters. These are supplemented by chapters on "The Playhouse and the Companies," and "The Stage and its Craft," which take advantage of the researches of such scholars as Graves, Adams, Thorndike and Chambers, and a summary chapter of admirable succinctness. Following the text is a selected bibliography, a list of principal dates, and a full index.

A work of this character has no place for controversial material, but the reviewer could wish that, without entering into the realm of disputation, Professor Schelling had added a chapter or two on the government regulations of the theatre, with the inevitable strictures of these regulations upon subject matter, and the extent to which the plays reveal, and the extent to which they conceal, social life and currents. Had he dared to do so, what dramas of the unfortunate, of political and social oppression, of suffering and tragedy could not Dekker have written! It is true, as stated in the concluding paragraph of the book, that "there is no body of writing so uniformly successful in its picture of the doings, the passions, and the ambitions of men," but there were doings in Elizabethan society and teeming passions, of the very essence of the dramatic, that found no voice or reflection on the stage. The Elizabethan drama is a picture, brilliant and many-sided, but it is not a wholly complete picture.

FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD.

University of Washington.

Le Génie du Paganisme. Essais sur l'inspiration antique dans la littérature française contemporaine. Par CHARLY CLERC.
Paris, Payot, 1926. 30 francs.

Dès les premières pages de son livre, M. Ch. Clerc s'excuse de son titre ambitieux et nous indique qu'il n'a pas voulu refaire la réfutation—bien facile d'ailleurs et devenue un lieu commun des manuels d'histoire littéraire—du célèbre ouvrage de Chateaubriand. Il nous a seulement donné une série d'études sur la vision et l'interprétation de l'antiquité par quelques-uns des auteurs les plus considérables de la littérature française depuis 1850. L'idée était intéressante : car, depuis Homère jusqu'à l'Alexandrie de *Thaïs* ou d'*Aphrodite*, l'antiquité grecque est assez vaste et assez riche pour que chacun de ceux qui s'en inspirent ne s'attache qu'à quelque fragment. Les uns gravissent l'Acropole avec une piété que provoque surtout en eux le dédain du christianisme ; les autres, pour rêver d'une vie sensuelle et plus libre ; d'autres encore se refont une âme païenne par dilettantisme de pensée, par haine du présent, ou simplement pour célébrer la puissance de la mort et le néant de toutes les religions. Mais "presque tous, depuis le Parnasse, s'efforcent de mettre au point les réalités dont ils parlent, de dégager cette âme antique, ce paganisme, des couleurs dont on les revêtait au cours des siècles précédents." (P. 28).

Après un chapitre général, M. Clerc entreprend donc l'étude de ces diverses visions de la Grèce. Renan et Taine, chefs d'une brillante génération littéraire, sont à l'entrée de cette longue galerie ; la *Prière sur l'Acropole* du premier, les pages enthousiastes du second dans sa *Philosophie de l'art*, méritaient en effet une place d'honneur ; chez tous deux, cependant, l'admiration n'est pas sans réserve ; le culte de la Grèce s'accompagne d'un certain trouble qui est parfois bien près d'une palinodie. C'est bien un vrai païen au contraire que Louis Ménard à qui est consacré le chapitre suivant, mais un "païen mystique" dont M. Clerc résume les idées originales et étranges. Quelques bonnes pages sur Leconte de Lisle évoquent la vision de la Grèce que nous offrent les "Poèmes Antiques" ; et si l'auteur ne lui épargne point le reproche d'avoir représenté une Grèce-musée et un hellénisme immobilisé en bas-reliefs de marbre, il traite du moins Leconte de Lisle avec plus d'indulgence qu'il n'est de mode parmi nos contemporains, auprès de qui le Parnasse ne semble pas être momentanément en faveur. Hérédia, Anatole France (dont la Grèce sensuelle et sceptique est étudiée dans un judicieux chapitre), Juliette Adam, Pierre Louys défilent ensuite ; le Barrès du *Voyage de Sparte* et le Ch. Maurras d'*Anthinée*. A. Samain et Henri de Régnier, Verhaeren, J. Moréas, Madame de Noailles, à qui est dédié tout l'ouvrage, enfin

les romanciers contemporains avec M. Magre, H. de Montherlant et E. Bourges. Un dernier chapitre résume bien les deux tendances dominantes auxquelles reviennent toujours ces évocateurs de la Grèce : Athènes ou Alexandrie, l'idéal attique de mesure et de beauté, ou l'attrait d'une civilisation cosmopolite et décadente.

M. Clerc avait à traiter un grand sujet dont les noms mêmes cités plus haut indiquent l'importance. Il est regrettable qu'il ait cru devoir le faire dans une série de chapitres détachés et non dans une étude d'ensemble plus solidement construite. Son livre ressemble trop souvent à une énumération de noms, dont quelques-uns étaient vraiment secondaires ici ; et s'il cite Marcelle Tinayre et Aug. Angellier, pourquoi négliger Claudel, traducteur de l'*Agamemnon* d'Eschyle et n'accorder au Valéry des dialogues socratiques que quelques lignes hâtives ? La lecture de son livre laisse une impression d'éparpillement qui déçoit un peu après ce beau titre. En plus d'un endroit aussi, M. Clerc s'est contenté de jugements un peu sommaires et de résumés rapides. Les pages consacrées par exemple à L. Ménard, à Hérédia, et à Moréas ne sont guère qu'une analyse, d'ailleurs fidèle et entrecoupée de citations, des poèmes que leur a inspirés la Grèce. Ça et là aussi, l'historien de la littérature serait en droit de demander compte à M. Clerc de quelques affirmations fort contestables. Dire, par exemple, à propos du Parthénon, que "Lamartine en avait perçu l'exiguïté, Renan en célèbre l'esprit aimable et fin" (p. 18) n'est donner qu'un aspect, très partiel, de la vérité, comme le verra facilement le lecteur en se reportant au contexte du *Voyage en Orient* et des *Souvenirs d'Enfance*. Est-il juste, de même, de parler d'une "renaissance de l'inspiration gréco-romaine au moment où s'éteint le romantisme" (p. 23) ? N'est-ce pas en grande partie au relativisme romantique qu'est due une plus juste interprétation de l'antiquité, et cette renaissance n'est-elle déjà pas sensible, après Chénier, chez Chateaubriand, Vigny, Musset, et bien d'autres moins glorieux représentants du romantisme ?

Le *Génie du Paganisme* contient donc le germe et l'indication d'une étude qui n'avait pas encore été faite et traite, avec plus ou moins de bonheur selon les chapitres, un sujet de toute première importance dans l'histoire littéraire du XIX^e et du XX^e siècles. C'est un livre qu'il sera désormais indispensable de consulter souvent ; quelques indications bibliographiques et un index rendent d'ailleurs facile l'utilisation de l'ouvrage. Il serait encore à souhaiter que les références comportent toujours non seulement le titre, mais aussi la page, du volume, et que les emprunts littéraires faits à d'autres critiques, par exemple aux *Sources de Leconte de Lisle* de M. Vianey, soient toujours indiqués par des guillemets (p. 63, 65, 66). Enfin, si M. Clerc donne quelque jour une seconde édition de son livre, qu'il fasse corriger avec soin les

coquilles et fautes d'impression assez nombreuses et particulièrement désagréables lorsqu' en citant les vers de ce poète si scrupuleux qu' était Leconte de Lisle, il appelle le Moyen Age "hideux siècles de fer" au lieu de "hideux siècles de foi" et qu'il nous parle du "chemin du Peros" au lieu du "chemin de Paros" (p. 57 et 58).

Bryn Mawr College.

HENRI PEYRE.

Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (bob-braca, pp. 417-480), von Professor WALTHER VON WARTBURG. Im Selbstverlag—Kommissionsverlag H. R. Sauerländer & Cie., Aarau.

The publication of the 7th fascicule of this work calls for remark from more than one point of view. In the first place, the fact that the book is being continued despite the business difficulties of the former publisher (Kurt Schroeder, Bonn-Leipzig) is a matter of moment for all those who are interested in etymology, German and English as well as French and Provençal. Professor von Wartburg's book unites the merits of the newer school of linguistic geographers with those of the older students of mediaeval philology. Only one who uses the book extensively can appreciate with what exemplary thoroughness and completeness it records not only the myriad forms of the numberless modern dialects of France, but also a large amount of material, much of it new, drawn from the attentive study of French and Provençal texts of the middle ages. In consequence, the history of many French words is revealed to us with a clearness and accuracy not hitherto attained. It is hoped that a detailed review of the work will be ready for publication in this journal at an early date.

The second aspect of interest is of a practical nature. It is the reason for the immediate publication of the present notice. Professor von Wartburg is not only carrying on the work of the dictionary under conditions as to time which most men would find impossible, but he has also undertaken the entire financial responsibility for the further publication of the dictionary. It will be possible for it to continue to appear only in case the number of its subscribers is materially increased. As the work, despite its extraordinary merits, is as yet relatively little known in our country, the attention of American scholars and libraries is requested to the importance of supporting it. The price of each of the seven fascicules is now six Swiss francs. It would be of advantage to the publisher if orders were sent directly to him. The eighth fascicule is expected to appear in the month of February, and from that time on one fascicule will be published every four months.

D. S. BLONDHEIM.

The Platonism of Joachim du Bellay. By ROBERT VALENTINE MERRILL. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1925.

The sixteenth century in French Literature has been attracting an ever increasing number of American scholars. Mr. Merrill's contribution throws a great deal of new light on that period. We have here not only a minute study of how Platonism influenced Joachim du Bellay but we also have a clear analysis of Platonism as understood by the poets of that time. This book should interest students of the history of philosophy as well as specialists in literature.

In the first chapter, entitled "Literary and Social Platonism in the Renaissance," the author draws the distinction between Neo-Platonism and true Platonism, a distinction which has not always been observed by students of the period. Another differentiation made at the start is that between Petrarchism and Platonism. A confusion has long existed between these two terms and Mr. Merrill renders a true service in carefully explaining in which way the two movements differed. The bibliography given in this chapter of Greek editions of the Dialogues of Plato which appeared in France, of Latin translations of the Dialogues, and of translations of important Platonistic works as well as French Platonistic works, is valuable to the student, for it gives information which hitherto has been scattered in various books.

The chapter "Platonistic Concepts in the Works of Du Bellay" gives an account of the poet's conception of the universe. He was interested in such ideas as the World-Soul and the Whole. The subject of Beauty and Virtue is one which found a great place in the writings of the philosophers and poets. Here Du Bellay follows more closely Platonic doctrine rather than, as in the case of his conception of the universe, pre-Platonic, Platonic, and post-Platonic theories and conceptions. It is when he becomes less interested in cosmology and metaphysics and more concerned with love between man and woman, Mr. Merrill points out, that he follows more closely Platonistic theories.

Two tendencies are to be found in the poet, one, to prefer psychology to philosophy in his Platonism, the other to interpret passages in his own way. He is not so much interested in the abstract notion as in the emotion of love. Du Bellay is most inspired when he gets the furthest away from the models of his predecessors. He borrows here and there some of the Platonistic ideas, such as for instance the myth of the Androgyne, but he goes no further than to use a word or phrase which might remind the reader of the source. He also uses the figure of the ladder which "has passed down through antiquity and the Middle Ages, carrying a significant portion of Platonistic doctrine."

After discussing the difficulty which the investigator encountered in determining to what extent a writer's work derives from another's and after giving four chief criteria by which this derivation may be tested, Mr. Merrill shows us that the influence of Plato on Du Bellay was rather through intermediate texts than directly through the philosopher. Ficino, Pontus, Castiglione, Bembo and even Héroët are among his models.

In the fourth chapter, which is devoted to the Development of Platonism in Du Bellay, and which is perhaps the most significant of the book, we have a detailed and keen analysis of what constituted "beauty" both at the time of Plato and in the Renaissance. We see how the *XIII Sonnets* are full of Platonistic terminology and thought, while later the poet drifted away from both Platonism and Petrarchism and gave the *Regrets*, which are full of beauty and the human touch. On the whole "his Platonism is of the spirit rather than of the word; and if there is in the French Renaissance a lyric poet who carries on the humanism of Bembo with the enthusiasm of the Gaul, that man is Joachim Du Bellay."

Mr. Merrill's study is a most helpful guide to investigators in the French Renaissance. And since it will undoubtedly be consulted by students of the period an index of proper names would be a valuable addition together with a bibliography of modern works on Platonism in the Renaissance.

HÉLÈNE HARVITT.

Hunter College Evening Session.

A French Grammar for High Schools and Colleges. By OLIVER M. JOHNSTON and JEFFERSON ELMORE. New York. Alfred A. Knopf, 1926. xi + 289 pp.

This text book which is the result of the collaboration of two scholars of kindred linguistic interests, one in Romance and the other in Latin, bears evidence of the rich pedagogical experience and conscientious industry of its authors. It markedly departs from other grammars for beginners in that verbal forms are dealt with at the outset, and special efforts is made to give systematic practice in learning them by the use of a drill exercise which is intended by the authors "to familiarize the learner with the mechanism of the verb forms from direct observation of the paradigms." This excellent feature is bound to facilitate a prompt acquisition of French verbs. Otherwise, in the presentation and treatment of the subject matter, as a whole, the authors appear to be methodically eclectic and to have favored no particular method; in fact, they have purposely avoided in their preface promises that cannot

consistently be fulfilled. The general impression one gathers from this grammar is that of practicability, adequacy, and sanity. It is a valuable addition to modern language texts.

The section on pronunciation discards cumbersome technicalities and consists only of information helpful to a beginner. The sounds are given in the ordinary spelling before the phonetic symbols are introduced. Consonants, syllabic division, liaison, word and group stress receive brief but sufficient attention. Phonetic transcriptions accompany every new word in each lesson throughout the book, but questions on phonetics proper are omitted. Each lesson is ingeniously devised. It includes the grammatical material which is explained in simple and clear language; a thorough-going drill exercise based upon it; a vocabulary made up of words and idioms used in daily life; reading selections of connected material which are varied, practical, and interesting and afford plentiful opportunities for oral work and topics for original composition; copious English-French exercises; questions in French, etc. The names of terms recommended by the Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature are used. Other features are noteworthy. The past absolute often relinquished among the last lessons in a beginner's text has a place in the fifteenth lesson; this is the proper attitude to assume as long as the chief object of the teaching of French in this country is the acquisition of a reading knowledge and most of our elementary readers contain ample subject matter told in this tense. The subjunctive is given considerable space, an impressive departure from certain elementary text books which neglect it as if this mood occupied only a minor part in a beginner's acquisition of French. Undoubtedly, a collaboration from the Latin and French points of view affords strong inducements to dwell, if only intermittently, on the field of philology, but the authors, remembering the character of their book, have indicated valuable historical connections but sparingly. At the end are found a good appendix for verb review and reference, a French-English vocabulary with phonetic transcriptions, an English-French vocabulary, and an index.

The proofreading has been excellently done; only a few misprints have been noticed: Page 37: *êtes-vous* for *êtes-vous*; p. 56: *paye* — *pe* for *pe*; j; p. 65: *vielle* for *vieille*; p. 68: *je n'y ai consenti pas* for *je n'y ai pas consenti*; p. 125: *epoque* for *époque*; p. 133: *plaisi* for *plaisir*; p. 177: *.e 14 juillet* for *le 14 juillet*; p. 195: *parlerion* for *parlerions*; p. 212: *d rment* for *dorment*; p. 234: *eprendre* for *éprendre*; *equivaloir* for *équivaloir*; p. 272: *irregulière* for *irrégulière*; p. 273: *s'ègarer* for *s'égarer*.

University of North Dakota.

HENRY E. HAXO.

Febru

RE

[I

Class

An An

Texts).

150. \$

Cruik

New W

Oxford

Pp. xxx

Gosse

The O

XVIIIth

Oxford

Hero

Versati

Univ. I

Hille

Actors.

Lit., V

1926.

Pp. 35

Kooi

Mercha

Zoon,

Lyn

Restor

gan Pu

1926.

Man

on Ch

305.

Quil

Dr. Jo

It. (

Macmi

Smith

Smith's

Studie

Press,

Till

verb L

Petite

peare.

Vol. 1

Pp. 4

Tren

ture.

Pp. 2

Tup

Mediev

Pp. 1

Win

a Str

Chica

1926.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[Books received up to Jan. 12.]

Classen, E. and Harmer, F. E. (Editors).—*An Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Md. Lang. Texts). *New York*: Longmans, 1926. Pp. 150. \$1.75.

Cruikshank, A. H. (Ed.).—*Massinger's A New Way to Pay Old Debts*. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, Amer. Branch, 1926. Pp. xxxiv, 141.

Gosse, Sir Edmund and Craigie, W. A.—*The Oxford Book of Scandinavian Verse, XVIIth Century-XXth Century*. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1925. Pp. 432.

Herold, Amos L.—*James Kirke Paulding, Versatile American*. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press, 1926. Pp. 167.

Hillebrand, Harold Newcomb.—*The Child Actors*. (Univ. of Ill. Studies in Lang. and Lit., Vol. XI, Nos. 1 and 2, Feb. and May, 1926. *Urbana*: Univ. of Ill. Press, 1926. Pp. 355.

Kooistra, J. (Ed.).—*Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice. Utrecht: Kemink and Zoon*, 1926. Pp. xx, 111.

Lynch, Kathleen M.—*The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy*. [University of Michigan Publications.] *New York*: Macmillan, 1926. Pp. 242.

Manly, John Matthews.—*Some New Light on Chaucer*. *New York*: Holt, 1926. Pp. 305.

Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur and Wilson, Dr. John Dover (Editors).—*As You Like It*. (The New Shakespeare). *New York*: Macmillan, 1926. Pp. xviii, 181.

Smith, Hamilton Jewett.—*Oliver Goldsmith's The Citizen of the World*. (Yale Studies, LXXI). *New Haven*: Yale Univ. Press, 1926. Pp. 175. \$2.00.

Tilley, Morris Palmer.—*Elizabethan Proverb Lore, in Lyly's Euphues and in Pettie's Petite Pallace with parallels from Shakespeare*. (Univ. Mich. Publ. Lang. and Lit., Vol. II). *New York*: Macmillan, 1926. Pp. 461. Price \$3.50.

Treener, A.—*The Sea in English Literature*. *London*: Hodder & Stoughton, 1926. Pp. 299.

Tupper, Frederick.—*Types of Society in Medieval Literature*. *New York*: Holt, 1926. Pp. 167.

Winslow, Ida Elizabeth.—*Low Comedy as a Structural Element in English Drama*. *Chicago*: The Univ. of Chicago Libraries, 1926. Pp. 186.

Wyatt, A. J.—*The Threshold of Anglo-Saxon*. *New York*: Macmillan, 1926. Pp. 126.

Zeitlin, Jacob (Ed.).—*Seventeenth Century Essays*. *New York*: Scribners, 1926. Pp. xliii, 346.

GERMAN

Bab, Jul.—*Die Chronik des Deutschen Dramas*. Tl. 5. *Deutschlands dramatische Produktion 1919-1926*. *Berlin*: Oesterheld & Co. [1926]. 375 pp. M. 6.50.

Baesecke, Georg.—*Wie studiert man Deutsch? Ratschläge für Anfänger*. 2. neubearb. Aufl. *München*: C. H. Beck, 1926. 39 pp. M. 1.60.

—*Lichtdrucke nach ahd. Hss.* Codd. Par. Lat. 7640, S. Gall. 911, Aug. CXI, Jan. 25, Lobcow. 434. Hrg. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1926. 4 pp., 38 plates, 41 x 37 cm. M. 12.

Brauer, Heinr.—*Die Bücherei von St. Gallen u. das ahd. Schrifttum*. [Hermæa. 17.] *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1926. xii, 103 pp. M. 5.60.

Brüggemann, F.—*Versuch einer Zeitfolge der Dramen des Herzogs Heinr. Jul. v. Braunschweig aus d. Jahren 1590 bis 1594*. [Veröffentl. d. Deu. Inst. a. d. Techn. Hochschule in Aachen, H. 2]. *Aachen*: Aachener Verlags- u. Druckerei-Ges. 1926. 53 pp. M. 2.

Büchel, Irmgard.—*Die Bezeichnungen für psychologische Begriffe in Wolframs Parzival*. [Giessener Beiträge. 16.] *Giessen*: v. Münchow, 1925. 56 pp. M. 2.30.

Castle, Eduard.—*In Goethes Geist. Vorträge und Aufsätze*. *Wien*: österr. Bundesverl. f. Unterr., 1926. xvi, 415 pp. M. 13.

—*Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung in Österreich-Ungarn. Nach dem Tode von J. W. Nagl u. Jakob Zeidler hrg. von —. Dritter (Schluss-) Band 1848-1918. 1. Abt. Wien*: Carl Fromme, 1926. 160 pp., 1 plate.

Darboven, A. M.—*Schillers sittliche Forderungen. Eine Einführung in die Entwicklung seiner Weltanschauung*. *München*: G. Müller, 1926. 174 pp. M. 4.

De Jonge, A. R.—*Gottfried Kinkel as Political and Social Thinker*. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press, 1926. xvi, 156 pp. \$1.75.

Goethe.—*Publications of the English Goethe Society, New Series, Vol. III. Papers read before the Society 1924-1926*. Ed. by J. G. Robertson. *London*: Alex. Moring, 1926. 144 pp.

Görte, Erna.—Der junge Tieck und die Aufklärung. [German. Studien, H. 45]. Berlin: E. Ebering, 1926. 102 pp. M. 4.

Jaeger, Hans.—Clemens Brentanos Frühlyrik. Chronologie und Entwicklung. [Deutsche Forschungen, H. 16]. Frankfurt a. M.: Diesterweg, 1926. xiv, 232 pp. M. 9.

Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft. Jg. 28. Hrg. v. K. Glossy. Wien: Amalteia-Verl. 1926. v, 181 pp. M. 6.

Karl-May-Jahrbuch 1926. Jahr 9. Hrg. Hrg. v. Ludw. Gurlitt u. E. A. Schmidt. Radebeul b. Dresden: Karl-May-Verlag. [1926]. 480 pp. M. 4.

Kayser, Werner.—Untypisches in der Epik des Mittelhochdeutschen. [Giessener Beiträge 17.]. Giessen: v. Münchow, 1926. 60 pp. M. 2.70.

Kluge, Friedr.—Nominale Stammbildungslehre der altgerm. Dialekte. 3 Aufl. Bearb. v. L. Sütterlin u. Ernst Ochs. [Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germ. Dialekte B. Erg.-Reihe Nr. 1.]. Halle: Niemeyer, 1926. xi, 155 pp. Cloth, M. 6.

Körner, Joseph.—Recht und Pflicht. Eine Studie über Kleists "Michael Kohlhaas" u. "Prinz Friedrich von Homburg." [Zsch. f. Deutschkunde. Erg. H. 19]. Leipzig: Teubner, 1926. 44 pp. M. 1.60.

Kraus, C. v.—Bruchstücke einer neuen Fassung des Eckenliedes [A] hrg. Tl. 1, 2 [Abh. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-philolog. Kl. Bd. 32, Abh. 3, 4]. München: R. Oldenbourg, 1926. 86 pp. 4°. M. 6.

Krause, Wolf.—Die Frau in der Sprache der altisländischen Familiengeschichten. [Zs. f. vergl. Sprachforschung auf d. Gebiete der indogerm. Sprachen, Erg.-H., Nr. 4.]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926. x, 247 pp. M. 16.

Laurin.—Ein tirolisches Heldenmärchen aus d. Anfänge d. 13. Jh. Hrg. v. K. Müllenhoff. 5. unveränd. Aufl. Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. 80 pp. M. 1.50.

Lendi, Karl.—Der Dichter Pamphilus Genzenbach. Beiträge zu s. Leben u. zu s. Werken. [Sprache u. Dichtung, H. 39]. Bern: Haupt, 1926. vii, 91 pp. M. 2.80.

Lewald, Fanny.—Römisches Tagebuch 1845/46. Hrg. v. Heinr. Spiero. Leipzig: Klinckschardt & Biermann, 1927. 308 pp. M. 4.80.

Mallon, Otto.—Brentano-Bibliographie (Clemens Brentano, 1778-1842). Berlin: S. M. Fraenkel, 1926. vi, 296 pp. Cloth, M. 14.

Mörke, Ed., u. Fr. Theod. Vischer. Briefwechsel. Hrg. v. Rob. Vischer. Mit 5 Abb. u. Faks. München: C. H. Beck, 1926. ix, 356 pp. M. 6.50.

Muthesius, K.—Goethe und das Handwerk. Sein Verhältnis zum werktätigen Volk u. zur handwerklich-künstlerischen Erziehung. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1927. vii, 164 pp., 7 plates. Cloth, M. 5.40.

Paul, Herm.—Mhd. Grammatik. 10 u. 11. Aufl., 2 Abdr. [Samml. kurzer Gramm. germ. Dial. 2.]. Halle: Niemeyer, 1926. xii, 227 pp. Cloth, M. 8.

Rogge, Alma.—Das Problem der dramatischen Gestaltung im deutschen Lustspiel. Diss. Hamburg: R. Hermes, 1926. 68 pp. M. 1.50.

Röhl, H.—Der Naturalismus. Ein Überblick über d. literar. Bewegung in Deutschland gegen Ende des 19. Jh. [Deutschkundliche Bücherei]. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1927. 69 pp. 80 Pf.

Schiller.—Selbstcharakteristik aus seinen Schriften. (Nach einem älteren Vorbilde neu hrg. v. Hugo v. Hofmannsthal.) München: Bremer Presse, 1926. 198 pp. M. 7.

Schulz, Hans.—Deutsches Fremdwörterbuch, fortgef. v. Otto Basler. Bd. 2, Lfg. 1, L.-M. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1926. Pp. 1-168, 4°. M. 6.80.

Streicher, Siegfried.—Spitteler und Böcklin. Bd. 1. Zürich: Orell Füssli [1926]. 126 pp. M. 4.40.

Weisser, Herm.—Die deutsche Novelle in Mittelalter. Auf d. Untergründe d. geistigen Strömungen. Freiburg: Herder, 1926. viii, 128 pp. M. 5.

Wolfram von Eschenbach.—Hrg. v. Alb. Leitzmann. [H. 2. Parzival, buch 7-11, 2. verb. Aufl. H. 5 Willehalm, buch 6-9; Titulrel; lieder. 2. verb. Aufl.] [Altd. Textbibl. 13. 16]. Halle: Niemeyer, 1926. xi, 193; xvii, 187 pp. M. 9.

Wukadinović, Sp.—Goethe-Probleme. Halle: Niemeyer, 1926. 97 pp. M. 3.60.

FRENCH

Addamiano, N.—Il rinascimento in Francia: Pietro Ronsard (1524-1585). Saggio di letteratura comparata. Palermo-Roma: R. Sandron, 1925. viii + 560 pp. L. 20. (Biblioteca Sandron di Scienze e lettere, no. 107.)

Aldington, R.—Voltaire. New York: Dutton, 1925. vii + 278 pp.

Archambault, P.—Jeunes Maitres. Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1926. 217 pp. Fr. 16.

Armstrong, E. C.—Authorship of the Vengeance Alixandre and of the Vengeance Alixandre. Princeton: Univ. Press, 1926. xiii + 55 pp. \$1. (Elliott Monographs.)

Auvergne, E. B. d'.—Pierre Loti. New York: Stokes, 1926. 253 pp. \$5.

Ballanche.—La Ville des expiations, éd. Rastoul. *Paris*: Belles-lettres, 1926. Fr. 12.

Barrès, M.—La Folie de Baudelaire. *Paris*: Écrivains réunis, 1926. 104 pp. Fr. 25.

Baudelaire.—Les Fleurs du mal avec une introd. de Paul Valéry. *Paris*: Payot, 1926. xxx + 351 pp.

Baumal, F.—Le Féminisme au temps de Molière. *Paris*: Renaissance du livre, 1926. 164 pp. Fr. 4.

Boillot, F.—Les impressions sensorielles chez La Fontaine. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1926. xvi + 376 pp. Fr. 30.

Boyd, E. A.—Guy de Maupassant; a biographical study. *New York*: Knopf, 1926. 267 pp. \$5.

Canzone di Rolando, La.—Versione e note a cura di M. Bonfantini. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1925. xvi + 76 pp. L. 7. (Scrittori stranieri tradotti.)

Carré, J. M.—La vie aventureuse de J. A. Rimbaud. *Paris*: Plon-Nourrit, 1926. iii + 256 pp.

—Michelet et son temps. *Paris*: Perrin, 1926. Fr. 12.

Cerf, B.—Anatole France, the degeneration of a great artist. *New York*: Dial, 1926. xi + 303 pp.

Charles d'Orléans.—Poésies, texte établi p. A. Pauphilet. *Paris*: Piazza, 1926. xix + 167 pp.

Chase, C. B.—The Young Voltaire. *New York*: Longmans, 1926. 262 pp. \$3.

Chateaubriand.—Selections, ed. G. Roger. *Oxford*: Clarendon, 1926. 138 pp.

Chinard, G.—The Commonplace Book of T. Jefferson. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1926. 403 pp. \$4. (J. H. Studies in R. L. L.)

Clerc, Charly.—Le Génie du paganisme. *Paris*: Payot, 1926. 286 pp. Fr. 25.

Dauzat, A.—La langue fr. *Paris*: Stock, 1926. Fr. 7.

Dubech, L.—J. Racine politique. *Paris*: Grasset, 1926. Fr. 15.

Eaton, R.—The best Fr. short stories of 1925-26. *New York*: Dodd, Mead, 1926. 355 pp. \$2.50.

Edwards, B.—Classification of the MSS. of Gui de Cambrai's Vengement Alixandre. *Princeton*: Univ. Press, 1926. vii + 51 pp. 80 cts. (Elliott Monographs.)

Fubini, M.—Jean Racine e la critica delle sue tragedie. *Torino*: "Sten" tip. edit., 1925. 290 pp. L. 12.50.

Gaudenzi, A.—Maupassant: appunti critici. *Bologna*: Stab. poligr. Riuniti, 1925. 40 pp.

Giese, W. F.—V. Hugo, the man and the poet. *New York*: Dial, 1926. ix + 315 pp.

Glaser, K.—Altfranzösisches Lesebuch des Späteren Mittelalters. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1926. xii + 208 pp.

Guiraud, J.—Dict. angl.-fr. *Saint-Cloud*: P. Belin, 1926. 216 pp. Fr. 80.

Heisig, K.—Studien zur Chanson de la Croisade contre les Albigeois. *Breslau*: Volkswacht-Buchdruckerei, 1926. 35 pp.

Karénine, W.—G. Sand. T. IV (1848-1876). *Paris*: Plon, 1926. viii + 760 pp. Fr. 60.

Lamartine.—L'Œuvre. IV. Recueils de poésies et Saül, éd. C. Grillet. *Lyon*: Vitte, 1926. 328 pp.

—Lettere inedite alla marchesa di Barolo, a cura di V. P. Ponti. Prefazione di P. Neri. *Torino*: Chiantore, 1926. 77 pp. L. 8.

Loti, P.—Journal intime, publ. par son fils, S. P. Loti-Viaud. *Paris*: Calmann-Lévy, 1926. 282 pp. Fr. 25.

Mangain, G.—Ronsard en Italie. *Strasbourg*: Faculté des lettres, 1926. Fr. 15.

Maupassant.—Cinq contes, ed. J. B. Paterson. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1926. 95 pp. 45 cts.

Maynial, E.—Précis de litt. fr. (1715-1925). *Paris*: Delagrave, 1926. 268 pp.

Molière.—Œuvres, t. I, éd. Jacques Copeau. *Paris*: Cité des livres, 1926. Fr. 60.

—Œuvres, t. II, éd. Guégan. *Paris*: Payot, 1926. 352 pp. Fr. 15.

Nerval, G. de.—Bibliographie de ses œuvres par A. Marie; Petits Châteaux de Bohême, éd. J. Marsan; Aurélia, par Audiat. *Paris*: Champion, 1926. Fr. 60 + 45 + 20.

Nicati, William.—Rabelais notre Maître. *Paris*: Maloine, 1926. 248 pp. Fr. 9.

Palache, J. G.—Gautier and the romantics. *New York*: Viking Press, 1926. 186 pp. \$3.

Philips, Edith.—L. H. Girardin and N. G. Duffie and their relations with Jefferson. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1926. 71 pp. 85 cts. (J. H. Studies in R. L. L.)

Pilon, E.—Barrès, souvenirs, notes et fragments de lettres inédites. *Paris*: Maison du livre fr., 1926. 62 pp. Fr. 6.

Porché, F.—La vie douloureuse de Baudelaire. *Paris*: Plon, 1926. xii + 304 pp. Fr. 15.

Prévost, J.—La Vie de Montaigne. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. Fr., 1926. 232 pp. Fr. 12.60.

—La pensée de Paul Valéry. *Nîmes*: Chastanier, 1926. 49 pp.

Rauhut, F.—Das Romantische u. Musikalische in der Lyrik Stéphane Mallarmés. *Marburg*: Braun, 1926. 55 pp. (Die Neueren Sprachen, Beiheft 11.)

Reynaud, L.—Le Romantisme. *Paris*: A. Colin, 1926. viii + 288 pp. Fr. 28.

Richard, C.—L'Enseignement en France. *Paris*: Colin, 1925. xv + 580 pp.

Riddle, L. M.—The Genesis and sources of Corneille's tragedies from Médée to Pertharite. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1926. xii + 22 pp. (J. H. Studies in R. L. L.).

Rousseau.—Confessions, éd. Van Bever. 3 vols. *Paris*: Garnier, 1926. 311 + 371 + 269 pp.

Sainte-Beuve.—Port-Royal, livre Premier, éd. Doyon et Marchesné. *Paris*: la Connaissance, 1926. xxix + 295 pp.

Saint Joan of Orleans, scenes from the Mystère d'Orléans, trans and ed. by Joan Evans and Paul Studer. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1926. xxxi + 191 pp. \$2.50.

Salverde de Grave et Staaff.—L'enseignement du fr. en Hollande et en Suède. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1926. 52 pp. (Etudes fr. 10e cahier). Fr. 6.

Simpson, E. L.—Five easy Fr. plays. *Boston*: Ginn, 1926. iv + 172 pp. 80 cts.

Sonné-Moret.—La Marquise de Sévigné. Une amie de la médecine, ennemie des médecins. *Paris*: Baillière, 1926. 124 pp. Fr. 5.

Stendhal.—Lucien Leuwen, éd. H. De braye et Paul Valéry. T. II. *Paris*: Champion, 1926. 462 pp.

Turquet-Milnes.—From Pascal to Proust. *New York*: Liveright, 1926. 192 pp. \$2.

ITALIAN

Alajmo, Concetta.—Il mito di Didone nella letteratura italiana. *Girgenti*: Tip. F. Montes, 1926. 187 pp. L. 7.

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Tragedie. Vol. II: La congiura de' Pazzi, Don Garzia, Maria Stuarda, Rosmunda, Ottavia, Timoleone, Merope. Vol. III: Saul, Agide, Sofonisba, Mirra, Bruto primo, Bruto secondo, Alceste. Introduzione e note di R. Dusi. *Torino*: Unione tip. edit. Torinese, 1926. 2 vols., 406 and 406 pp. L. 24. (Classici italiani con note, seconda serie, nos. 2, 3.)

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia, Vol. I: l'Inferno, con commenti, note e saggio proemiale dei proff. F. Flamini ed A. Pompeati. *Milano*: F. Vallardi, 1925. lxxxviii + 479 pp. L. 20. (Biblioteca di classici italiani annotati.)

Batacchi, Domenico Luigi.—Lo Zibaldone. Poema in dodici canti. *Milano*: "L'Aristo-

cratica," 1926. 290 pp. L. 20. (Collana di testi e documenti per servire alla storia dei costumi. I Classici dell' amore, no. 31.)

Biondolillo, F.—Dentro all'alta fantasia, Saggi danteschi. *Messina-Roma*: G. Principato, 1925. 158 pp. L. 12.

Boccaccio, Giovanni.—Il Decameron, riscontrato co' migliori testi e postillato da P. Fanfani. Dodicesima impressione con l'aggiunta delle osservazioni su questa edizione e sulla sintassi del Boccaccio di A. Mussafia. Vol. I e II. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1926. 2 vols., lix + 389, 573 pp. L. 16.

Borgomaneri, Teresa.—Il romanticismo nel teatro di G. B. Niccolini. *Milano*: G. Bolla, 1926. 335 pp. L. 15.

Brovedani, J. H.—Aspetti di letteratura contemporanea italiana attraverso le opere e la critica. *Kingston, Ont.*: Van Patten, 1926. 158 pp. \$2.00.

Buonaiuti, E.—Francesco d'Assisi. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1926. 80 pp. L. 5. (Profili, no. 79.)

Calcaterra, C.—La "Data fatale" nel "Canzoniere" e nei "Trionfi" del Petrarca. *Torino*: G. Chiantore, 1926. 35 pp. L. 8.

Campanini, N.—Il canto X del Purgatorio letto nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 36 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Cellini, Benvenuto.—La vita scritta da lui medesimo. *Firenze*: A. Salani, 1926. 556 pp. L. 6.50. (Edizione Florentina: i classici, no. 35.)

Chabod, F.—Del Principe di Niccolò Machiavelli. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1926. 101 pp. L. 4. (Biblioteca della "Nuova rivista storica," no. 8.)

De Luca, Adriana.—I traduttori umanisti dei poemi omerici: Vincenzo Obsopoeo. *Palermo*: Scuola tip. "Boccone del povero," 1925. 88 pp. L. 8.

Del Viscovo, M.—Nugae. *Torino*: Tip. E. Arduini, 1926. 34 pp. L. 5.

— Paolo Costa: l'uomo, l'artista, il filosofo. *Torino*: Tip. E. Arduini, 1926. 105 pp. L. 10.

Folengo, Teofilo (Merlin Cocai).—Macaronicae, a cura di G. Lipparini. Con xilografie di E. Mantelli. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1925. xv + 190 pp. (Classici del ridere, no. 57.)

Francesco, San.—I Fioretti di —, con commento di L. Ascoli e prontuario biografico e geografico di E. Vampa. *Milano*: U. Hoepli, 1926. xxvii + 428 pp.

— I Fioretti di — da un codice della biblioteca reale di Torino a cura del p. Francesco Sarri dei minori. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1926. 224 pp. L. 2.

Garbini, A.—Antroponimie ed omonimie nel campo della zoologia popolare. Saggio limitato a specie veronesi. Parte II, vol. I e II. *Verona*: La Tipografica Veronese, 1925. 2 vols., 1071, 1076-1598 pp. (Accademia di agricoltura, scienze e lettere.)

Giacomo, R.—Lettere inedite di Giambattista Bodoni. Precede una notizia della raccolta di lettere del secolo XVI, XVII, XVIII e XIX, che si conserva nel Castello di Verzuolo. *Carmagnola*: Tip. Scolastica, 1926. 37 pp.

Marussig, G.—Scrittori d'oggi, con un saggio su l'arte e la critica. *Roma*: Libreria di scienze e lettere, 1926. 347 pp. L. 17.50.

Mauro, A.—Francesco Del Tuppo e il suo "Esopo." *Città di Castello*: Casa edit. "Il Solco," 1926. 252 pp. L. 12. (Biblioteca di coltura letteraria, no. 5.)

Mazzini, Giuseppe.—Pagine tratte dall'epistolario, da U. Zanotti-Bianco. *Milano*: G. Morreale, 1926. x + 636 pp. (Istituto italiano per il libro del popolo.)

Mazzoni, G.—Il canto XII dell' Inferno letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 33 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Ogetti, Ugo (Tantalo).—Cose viste. Terzo tomo. *Milano*: Fratelli Treves, 1926. 316 pp. L. 11.

Perito, E.—La congiura dei Baroni e il Conte di Policastro, con l'edizione completa e critica dei Sonetti di G. A. De Petrucciis. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1926. 292 pp. L. 22. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 132.)

Petrarca, Francesco.—Rime, con note di N. Vaccalluzzo. *Catania*: C. Galàtola, 1925. 165 pp. L. 10.

Polese, F.—Letteratura vernacola livornese. Bibliografia, note storiche, testi inediti, con un'appendice sul monumento dei Quattro Mori. *Livorno*: R. Giusti, 1926. vii + 237 pp. L. 12.

Praga, M. (Emmepi).—Cronache teatrali 1925. *Milano*: Fratelli Treves, 1926. 326 pp. L. 11.

Puccini, M.—La vera colpevole. *Aquila*: Casa edit. tip. Vecchioni, 1926. 240 pp. L. 8. (Collezione di scrittori italiani e stranieri, no. 3.)

Sannazaro, Jacopo.—Arcadia. Introduzione e note di E. Carrara. *Torino*: Unione tip. edit. Torinese, 1926. xxxix + 157 pp. L. 8. (Classici italiani con note, serie II, no. 52.)

Savonarola, Fra Girolamo.—Della semplicità della vita cristiana. Antico volgarizzamento di Girolamo Benivieni, con prefazione

zione del p. Lodovico Ferretti. *Firenze*: Libr. edit. Fiorentina, 1925. xliii + 143 pp. L. 6. (I libri della fede, vol. 22.)

Schiaffini, A.—Testi fiorentini del Duecento e dei primi del Trecento, con introduzione, annotazioni linguistiche e glossario a cura di —. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1926. 336 pp. L. 90. (Autori classici e documenti di lingua pubblicati dalla r. Accademia della Crusca.)

Tarozzi, G.—Il canto XVIII del Purgatorio letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 42 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Turolla, E.—La tragedia del mondo nella poesia civile di Giovanni Pascoli. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1926. xxvii + 238 pp. L. 16.

Virgilio, P. M.—L'Eneide, tradotta da Annibal Caro. Introduzione e note di G. Lipparini. *Torino*: Unione tip. edit. Torinese, 1926. xxxix + 388 pp. L. 10. (Classici italiani con note, seconda serie, no. 22.)

Virnicchi, P.—Spunti francescani, in occasione del settimo centenario francescano. Stampato a cura ed a beneficio de l'erigenda biblioteca di cultura fascista. *Napoli*: Stab. Industrie edit. Meridionali, 1926. 50 pp. L. 5.

Volta, Alessandro.—Scritti inediti, con notizie storiche, a cura di G. Ceruti. Per le nozze Colombo-Serafini. *Como*: Casa edit. Omarini di Moresi e Nosedà, 1925. 38 pp.

Weidlich, C.—Critici d'oggi: Baldini, D'Amico, Moscardelli, Palazzi, Pancrazi, Papini, Piccoli, Prezolini, Russo, Tartarini, Tonelli. *Palermo*: Casa edit. "L'Onidina," 1926. 47 pp. L. 3.

Zardo, A.—Il canto V del Paradiso letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 33 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

SPANISH

Alonso Cortés, N.—Miscelánea Vallisoleana. Cuarta Serie. *Valladolid*: Impr. del Colegio de Santiago. 1926. 171 pp.

Alvarado Albo, F.—Crónica del III Centenario de la Universidad de Oviedo. (1608-1908). *Barcelona*: Talleres de Oliva Vilanova, 1925. 187 pp. + 58 láms.

Bahr, H.—Notizen zur neueren Spanischen Literatur. *Berlin*: Stilke, 1926. 57 pp.

Baroja, P.—Zalacaín el aventurero. Ed. with notes and vocabulary by A. L. Owen. Critical introduction by Federico de Onís. *New York*: Heath and Co., 1926. xxi + 219 pp.

Blázquez y Delgado-Aguilera, A.—A propósito de la Crónica de Alfonso III. *Escorial*: Imp. Real Monasterio, 1926. 29 pp.

Blest Gana, A.—Martín Rivas. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary by G. W. Umphrey. *New York*: Heath and Co., 1926. xi + 269 pp. (Spanish-American Series, 3.)

Calderón.—Autos sacramentales. I. Ed. y notas de A. Valbuena. *Madrid*: "La Lectura," 1926. 261 pp. 5 ptas. (Clásicos Castellanos, 69.)

Cartulario de San Pedro de Arlanza, antiguo monasterio benedictino. Publicado por L. Serrano. *Madrid*: 1925. xv + 299 pp. (Junta para Ampliación de Estudios.)

Castro, Guillén de.—La tragedia por los celos. Ed. with an introduction, variants and notes, by H. Alpern. *Paris*: Champion, 1926. 150 pp.

Cervantes.—Don Chisciotte. Episodi e frammenti a cura di G. Marone. *Napoli*: Casella, 1925. 128 pp.

—Don Chisciotte della Mancia. Traduzione e note di A. Giannini. Vol. III. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1926. 376 pp.

—Obras completas. Novelas ejemplares. Ed. Schevill y Bonilla. Tomo III. *Madrid*: Gráficas Reunidas, 1925. 406 pp. 6 ptas.

Condon, V.—Spanish irregular verbs. Exercises and verb blanks. *New York*: Holt, 1926. 52 pp. + verb blanks. 68 cents.

Díaz de Escovar, N. y Lasso de la Vega, F. de P.—Historia del teatro español. Comediantes. Escritores. Curiosidades escénicas. Con un apéndice sobre los teatros catalán y valenciano, por J. Bernat y Durán. Dos vols. *Barcelona*: Montaner y Simón. 472 y 422 pp. xxiv pp. lix láms. 30 ptas.

García Gutiérrez, A.—El trovador. Ed. by P. P. Rogers. *Boston*: Ginn and Co., 1926. xx + 165 pp.

García-Rendueles, E.—Los nuevos babilistas. Las mejores poesías en dialecto asturiano de los poetas del siglo XIX, coleccionadas y anotadas por . . . Primera parte: Antología. *Gijón*: Imp. "La Reconquista," 1925. xvii + 359 pp.

Góngora.—Poesías. *Cuenca*: Velasco, 1925. 97 pp. (Letras españolas. IV.)

Isaacs, J.—María. Ed. with notes, exercises and vocabulary by J. Warshaw. *New York*: Heath and Co., 1926. xiv + 298 pp. (Spanish-American Series, 2.)

La leggenda di Bernardo del Carpio.—Estratto di due drammi di Lope de Vega, ordinati da A. Monteverdi. *Roma*: Bardi, 1926. 64 pp. (Biblioteca Neo-Latina.)

Mármol, J.—Amalia. Ed. with notes, exercises and vocabulary by S. E. Leavitt. *New York*: Heath and Co., 1926. xiv + 227 pp. (Spanish-American Series, 4.)

Martínez Sierra, G.—Mamma. Il sogno di una notte d'agosto. *Milano*: Mondadori, 1925. 132 pp.

Mézan, S.—Les juifs espagnols en Bulgarie. Édition d'essai. *Sofia*: Imp. Amischpat, 1925. 150 pp.

Palacio Valdés, A.—Marta y María. Ed. with introduction, notes, exercises and vocabulary by H. M. Martin. *Boston*: Ginn and Co., 1926. xv + 316 pp. \$1.12.

Pardo, Bazán, E.—Cuadros religiosos. Prólogo de L. Araujo Costa. *Madrid*: Blasa, 1925. 147 pp.

Pérez Galdós, B.—Zaragoza. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary by J. Van Horne. *Boston*: Ginn and Co., 1926. xxxvi + 287 pp.

Poemas épicos.—Colección dispuesta y revisada, con un prólogo y un catálogo, por C. Rosell. Tomo II. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1925. 518 pp. 12 ptas. (B. A. E. Tomo XXIX.)

Poetas líricos del siglo XVIII.—Colección formada e ilustrada por L. A. de Cueto. Tomo II. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1925. 641 pp. 12 ptas. (B. A. E. Tomo LXIII.)

Romances viejos castellanos.—*Madrid*: Ed. Voluntad, 1925. 99 pp. 1.75 ptas. (Letras Españolas.)

Trend, J. B.—The Music of Spanish History to 1600. *Oxford*: University Press, 1926. xv + 288 pp. 12 shillings, 6 d. (The Hispanic Society of America. Hispanic Notes and Monographs. X.)

Vega, Lope de.—Poesías líricas. I: Primeros romances. Letras para cantar. Sonetos. Ed., prólogo y notas de J. F. Montesinos. *Madrid*: "La Lectura," 1925. 296 pp., 5 ptas. (Clásicos Castellanos, 68.)

—La stella di Siviglia. Traduzione di G. Marone. *Napoli*: Casella, 1925. 289 pp.

Verdad, M.—Miguel de Unamuno. *Roma*: Lib. Política Moderna, 1925. 37 pp.

Ximénez, R. P. F. F.—Las historias del origen de los indios de esta provincia de Guatemala, traducidas de la lengua quiché al castellano para más comodidad de los ministros del S. Evangelio por el —. Exactamente según el texto español del manuscrito original que se halla en la Biblioteca de la Universidad de Guatemala, publicado por primera vez, y aumentado con una introducción y anotaciones por el doctor C. Scherzer. *San Salvador*: Imp. Nacional, 1926. xvi + 135 pp.